

In The Matter Of:

*Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
Special Investigation*

*Deposition of John Bolton
July 10, 1997
CONFIDENTIAL*

*Miller Reporting Company, Inc.
507 C Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 546-6666 FAX: (202) 546-1502*

*Original File 0710bolt.asc, 76 Pages
Min-U-Script® File ID: 0273192376*

Word Index included with this Min-U-Script®

Page 1

UNITED STATES SENATE
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
In the Matter of :
SPECIAL INVESTIGATION :

Washington, D.C.

Thursday, July 10, 1997

The deposition of JOHN BOLTON, called for examination by counsel for the United States Senate, Committee on Governmental Affairs, Room 326, Dirksen Senate Office Building, commenced at 9:28 a.m., before Susan A. Harris, a notary public in and for the District of Columbia, when were present on behalf of the parties:

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the Committee on
Governmental Affairs:

LISA E. ROSENBERG, ESQ.
HOWARD SKLAMBERG, ESQ.
DAVID MCKEAN, ESQ.

Counsel, Special Investigation, Minority Staff
United States Senate
Committee on Governmental Affairs
Washington, D.C. 20510
(202) 224-2627
PHILIP PERRY, ESQ.

Counsel, Special Investigation, Majority Staff
United States Senate
Committee on Governmental Affairs
Washington, D.C. 20510
(202) 224-2000

Page 2

CONTENTS

WITNESS: EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL
John Bolton

By Ms. Rosenberg 4

EXHIBITS

BOLTON DEPOSITION EXHIBITS MARKED
No. 1 5

Page 3

PROCEEDINGS

Whereupon,

JOHN BOLTON

was called for examination by counsel for the Committee on Governmental Affairs and, having been first duly sworn by the notary public, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR THE MINORITY
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

BY MS. ROSENBERG:

Q: Good morning, Mr. Bolton.

A: Good morning.

Q: Thank you for agreeing to join us today for this voluntary deposition. I'm Lisa Rosenberg. I'm counsel for the minority in this special investigation of the United States Senate. Also here in Phil Perry, counsel for the majority.

And just for the record, we understand you're here not pursuant to a subpoena; you're here voluntarily to answer questions.

A: Right.

Q: You are not represented by counsel?

A: That's correct.

Q: And again you understand you could be represented by counsel and you've just chosen not to be, correct?

A: That's correct.

Page 4

Page 5

MR. PERRY: Let me ask a quick question here. Has the minority contacted counsel for the NPF regarding this deposition?

MS. ROSENBERG: No, I have not contacted counsel for the NPF regarding this deposition.

MR. PERRY: And you're taking, obviously, this deposition, in part, to probe matters regarding Mr. Bolton's employment at the NPF, correct?

MS. ROSENBERG: That is correct.

MR. PERRY: Please proceed.

THE WITNESS: Let me say I haven't contacted counsel for NPF about this deposition, either.

MS. ROSENBERG: All right, we have that on the record.

And, for background and pursuant to Mr. Bolton's request, we would like to have marked as Exhibit Number 1 a letter to Mr. Bolton confirming that he was here voluntarily, as well as an attachment which is the order of Senator Thompson regarding the scope of this investigation. [Bolton Deposition Exhibit No.

1 was marked for identification.]

BY MS. ROSENBERG:

Q: Mr. Bolton, would you state your name and current business address for the record?

Page 6

A: John R. Bolton. I'm senior vice president of the American Enterprise Institute, 1150 17th Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C.

Q: And would you describe briefly your educational background since high school?

A: Sure. I graduated from Yale College in 1970 and Yale Law School in 1974.

Q: Okay. And any other educational experience since law school?

A: A lot of educational experiences. No formal degree.

Q: And would you describe your employment history, please, just broadly in resume fashion?

A: Sure. When I graduated from law school I became an associate at Covington & Burling in Washington. I was there until early in 1981, when I joined the Reagan Administration, where I served first very briefly in the acting counsel for the President's office. Then, in February of 1981, I became general counsel of the U.S. Agency for International Development. I served in that position until February of 1982, when I became assistant administrator of AID for program and policy coordination. I stayed there until July 1983. When I left, I became a partner at Covington & Burling and, during that same time, I was executive director of the 1984 Republican

Page 7

Platform Committee.

I left Covington & Burling in December of 1985 when I was confirmed as assistant attorney general for legislative affairs. I served in that capacity until March of 1988, when I became assistant attorney general in charge of the Civil Division.

I stayed there until May of 1989, when I was confirmed as assistant secretary of state for international organizations. I stayed there until January 19, 1993. When I left, I was briefly at the Manhattan Institute. I practiced law at the firm of Lerner, Reed, Bolton & Sanders.

I became president of the National Policy Forum in January of 1995 and served until the end of December 1996. I was still practicing law during that period. And I have been senior vice president of AEI since January 1 of this year.

Q: Okay. Just a couple of questions, working backwards. You continued practicing law affiliated with Lerner, Reed, Bolton & Sanders during the time you were at NPF?

A: That's correct, and still do today.

Q: Okay. My next question.

A: Although it's now called Lerner, Reed, Bolton & McMannis.

Q: Thank you.

Page 8

(1) MR. PERRY: Is that in town?
(2) THE WITNESS: Yes.
(3) BY MS. ROSENBERG:
(4) Q: And what kind of law do you practice with Lerner,
Reed?
(5) A: Principally international law, a variety of
(6) different sorts, some litigation.
(7) Q: Is there any lobbying involved with Lerner - do
(8) you do any lobbying with Lerner, Reed?
(9) A: Not in the sense of lobbying Congress.
(10) Q: In any sense?
(11) A: No. I have contact with executive branch agencies
(12) from time to time on matters that are before clients -
(13) contract disputes, that sort of thing.
(14) Q: And did you ever do any lobbying during your time
(15) at Lerner, Reed?
(16) A: I have done some lobbying there and did some
(17) lobbying at Covington & Burling before that.
(18) Q: Did you do lobbying while you were at NPF?
(19) A: Not on the Hill and not other than for client
(20) dispute matters with the Federal Government. In other
(21) words, these are not matters in adjudication but they were
(22) contract disputes with, for example, AID.
(23) Q: For example, what?
(24) A: AID.
(25)

Page 9

(1) Q: And you mentioned that you practice in the area of
(2) international law. When you have had lobbying clients, have
(3) some of those been international companies, organizations,
(4) individuals?
(5) A: No.
(6) Q: They've been all local, U.S. domestic -
(7) A: U.S. domestic.
(8) Q: Organizations.
(9) You said that you were assistant secretary of
(10) state for international organizational affairs; is that
(11) correct?
(12) A: Organizations, yes.
(13) Q: And that was with the Bush Administration?
(14) A: That's correct.
(15) Q: And who appointed you to that?
(16) A: The President.
(17) Q: And what were your duties and responsibilities in
(18) that position?
(19) A: I was overall in charge of U.S. policy in the U.N.
(20) system and various other international organizations.
(21) Q: And you also mentioned that you were executive
(22) director of the '84 Republican Platform Committee.
(23) A: That's correct.
(24) Q: Was that a paid position?
(25) A: I received compensation as a consultant in July -

Page 10

(1) I'm sorry - in August and September of 1983. Then I
(2) received some compensation - I'm not sure of that now. I
(3) don't think I did receive compensation from the Platform
(4) Committee.
(5) Q: Okay. And how did you come to be on the Platform
(6) Committee?
(7) A: I wasn't actually a member of it. I was the
(8) executive director. The members are delegates of the
(9) convention. Paul Laxalt asked me to do it.
(10) Q: I'm sorry, Paul -
(11) A: Laxalt. L-a-x-a-l-t.
(12) MR. PERRY: Nevada?
(13) THE WITNESS: Yes, R-Nev.
(14) BY MS. ROSENBERG:
(15) Q: And again, as executive director of the Platform
(16) Committee, what were your duties and responsibilities?
(17) A: I was overall in charge of the staff of the
(18) Platform Committee, preparing the draft of the platform. I
(19) usually worked with Trent Lott, who was chairman of the
(20) Platform Committee.
(21) Q: So you had input into the platform of the
(22) Republican Party at that point?
(23) A: Yes.
(24) Q: Okay. Let's move on to your employment at NPF.
(25) When did you first learn of NPF's existence?

Page 11

(1) A: Probably sometime in 1993, probably around the
(2) summer when its formation was announced.
(3) Q: And who do you recall learning that from?
(4) A: I don't recall any specific individual.
(5) Q: In the summer of '93, did you know Haley Barbour?
(6) A: I'd known Haley Barbour since at least the summer
(7) of 1976.
(8) Q: Did Haley Barbour discuss the formation of the
(9) National Policy Forum with you?
(10) A: Not as such. Right after he became chairman he
(11) discussed his idea. He called me and we discussed his idea
(12) of finding a better policy mechanism for the Republican
(13) Party as a whole and we talked about several things, but at
(14) that point I don't think the idea of a National Policy Forum
(15) came up.
(16) Q: Did Haley Barbour ever discuss with you the idea
(17) of the National Policy Forum per se prior to its formation?
(18) A: Prior to its formation, no.
(19) Q: Were you in any way involved in the formation of
(20) the National Policy Forum?
(21) A: Not in the formation.
(22) Q: What did you know about the National Policy Forum
(23) when you first learned of it?
(24) A: I think the first knowledge I had was the
(25) announcement that a number of policy councils were being

Page 12

(1) created and I signed up for the Foreign Policy Council and
(2) was a member of that council.
(3) Q: And when was that that you signed up for that
(4) council?
(5) A: Sometime in the summer or fall of 1993.
(6) Q: And what was your role in the policy council?
(7) A: There were a couple of meetings. There was a kind
(8) of organizational meeting chaired by Senator Lugar and
(9) Senator Kassebaum, who were the co-chairs of that council,
(10) in the fall of 1993. There were a couple of meetings to
(11) discuss drafts of the document that later became Listening
(12) for America, which was published in the summer of 1994, and
(13) I think that's it.
(14) Q: And what was the specific council you were on?
(15) A: The Foreign Policy Council. There were 14 or 15,
(16) I think, original policy councils.
(17) Q: And did anyone from the National Policy Forum ask
(18) you to be on the Foreign Policy Council?
(19) A: No, I think this was in response to a general
(20) mailing that I received and I returned the form.
(21) Q: Were you asked to contribute to the National
(22) Policy Forum?
(23) A: Never specifically. I received a lot of mail from
(24) the forum. It wouldn't surprise me if in one of those there
(25) was a generalized request to contribute, but I never did.

Page 13

(1) Q: Do you know how you came to be on the mailing list
(2) of the National Policy Forum?
(3) A: I don't.
(4) Q: Prior to becoming president of the National Policy
(5) Forum, and other than the policy council work you just
(6) mentioned, did you have any other involvement with the
(7) National Policy Forum?
(8) A: I think I spoke to Mike Baroody once or twice
(9) about it. I spoke to Judy van Rest on several occasions in
(10) connection with an article of mine that they published in
(11) Common Sense in the summer of 1994 on the United Nations.
(12) Q: And what did you speak to Mike Baroody about?
(13) A: A number of ways that I might be helpful to the
(14) council. There was some discussion about whether I might
(15) join the National Policy Forum and that didn't eventuate. I
(16) talked to him about some of the things he might be doing
(17) with the National Policy Forum. Very general conversation.
(18) MR. PERRY: Could you give us a time frame for
(19) that?
(20) THE WITNESS: Summer of '93, fall of '93.
(21) BY MS. ROSENBERG:
(22) Q: How did you know Mr. Baroody?
(23) A: I met him first, I think, in the early 1970s.
(24) When I was a law student I did research and writing for two
(25) of my law professors, Ralph Winter and Bob Bork, who were

Page 14

(1) adjunct scholars at the American Enterprise Institute, which
(2) was headed at that time by - in the early '70s - by Bill
(3) Baroody, Senior, who was Mike Baroody's father, at a time
(4) when I think Mike Baroody worked for Senator Dole. And it
(5) would have been sometime in that period.
(6) Q: And did you remain friendly or at least in contact
(7) with Mr. Baroody -
(8) A: Yes, I met him professionally from time to time.
(9) Q: So you knew him when he became president of the
(10) National Policy Forum?
(11) A: Yes.
(12) Q: And when you spoke to him about the National
(13) Policy Forum, were these conversations that you initiated or
(14) conversations that he initiated?
(15) A: I don't really recall who initiated them.
(16) Q: And in the summer of '93 through the fall of '93,
(17) I believe is when you said you'd spoken to him, or through
(18) '94, roughly how often did you speak with him?
(19) A: During that 18-month period, two or three times.
(20) Q: These were conversations over the phone?
(21) A: Over the phone. The National Policy Forum had a
(22) couple of functions in Washington. I think I saw him at at
(23) least one of those, that sort of thing.
(24) Q: Prior to being employed at the National Policy
(25) Forum, other than speaking to Mike Baroody and Judy van

Page 15

(1) Rest, was there anyone else at the National Policy Forum
(2) that you spoke to?
(3) A: I'm sure I spoke to people in connection with
(4) going to some of these meetings for the preparation of the
(5) text of Listening to America, but those were clerical
(6) conversations.
(7) Q: Once the National Policy Forum was up and running
(8) but before you came onto the National Policy Forum, did you
(9) speak with Haley Barbour about the NPF?
(10) A: I don't think so. I don't think so.
(11) Q: Did you speak with Donald Fierce?
(12) A: Not before - I had never met Mr. Fierce until
(13) after Mr. Barbour first approached me about becoming
(14) president.
(15) Q: And when did Mr. Barbour first approach you about
(16) becoming president?
(17) A: Sometime after the 1994 congressional election,
(18) before Thanksgiving sometime.
(19) Q: So November of '94?
(20) A: Yes.
(21) Q: And that was the first time anyone had approached
(22) you about becoming president of NPF?
(23) A: Yes.
(24) Q: And how did Mr. Barbour first contact you? Was it
(25) by telephone or in person?

Page 16

(1) A: By telephone.
(2) Q: And can you describe to me that first telephone
(3) conversation with Mr. Barbour?
(4) A: He asked me if I'd be interested in becoming
(5) president. We talked a little bit over the phone about what
(6) that might entail and I think we agreed to meet shortly
(7) thereafter, but I don't remember whether that would have
(8) also been in November or whether that was early December.
(9) The phone conversation, I think, was fairly brief.
(10) Q: Do you recall, during the phone conversation, what
(11) he might have said becoming president of NPF would entail?
(12) A: The idea of NPF that attracted me was having a
(13) vehicle to help develop Republican policies. What Mr.
(14) Barbour had said when he was seeking to become chairman of
(15) the RNC in '92 and '93 was that the '92 election showed that
(16) the party had lost the intellectual ferment and creativity
(17) that it had in the late 1970s and he was interested in
(18) helping to recreate it.
(19) I certainly shared that analysis and thought this
(20) would be an exciting way to do exactly that.
(21) Q: In the first telephone conversation with Mr.
(22) Barbour, did he mention that fund-raising would be an
(23) important part of your job?
(24) A: I don't think fund-raising came up.
(25) Q: Do you have any idea how long the phone

Page 17

(1) conversation was?
(2) A: Couple of minutes.
(3) Q: Were you surprised when he called you and asked
(4) you to be president?
(5) A: Yes.
(6) Q: Do you know how he got your name, why he thought
(7) of you as a potential candidate for president?
(8) A: I don't know. I suppose you could ask him.
(9) Q: When was the next conversation you had with Mr.
(10) Barbour?
(11) A: As I said, we met, I believe, in his office
(12) sometime shortly thereafter. I don't recall the date.
(13) Thanksgiving was in there somewhere and we had to work
(14) around that.
(15) Q: Was anyone else at the meeting?
(16) A: No.
(17) Q: And how long was the meeting?
(18) A: Approximately a half an hour or so.
(19) Q: And what was discussed at that meeting?
(20) A: What the responsibilities of being president would
(21) be, some of his ideas for what NPF would be doing in 1995-
(22) 1996, what the existing staff structure was, a pretty broad
(23) array of topics.
(24) Q: Did you discuss your salary and compensation at
(25) that meeting?

Page 18

(1) A: Yes.
(2) Q: Did you discuss NPF's budget at that meeting?
(3) A: We discussed it in general terms. I don't think
(4) there was any discussion of specific figures.
(5) Q: Did you discuss NPF's financial situation at that
(6) point; in other words, whether NPF was in debt at that
(7) point?
(8) A: Yes, we discussed what he expected would be the
(9) allocation responsibilities for revenues and expenses,
(10) which, very briefly stated, were that he would take the bulk
(11) of the responsibility for fund-raising. I had told him that
(12) I had essentially no fund-raising experience for this sort
(13) of thing. He said he understood that. He was interested in
(14) me because of my policy background but said that he hoped,
(15) in terms of explaining the work that NPF was doing, that I
(16) would be prepared to meet with potential contributors.
(17) We discussed the responsibilities for managing NPF
(18) and he made it clear that I would be responsible, as
(19) president, for all management, that he was obviously the
(20) chairman of the board.
(21) We discussed the fact that NPF was set up
(22) separately from the RNC and had applied for 501(c)(4)
(23) status. I know a bit about that area of the law and I
(24) discussed with him the importance of keeping it both
(25) operationally and organizationally separate from the RNC and

Page 19

(1) he fully agreed with that.
(2) MR. PERRY: Can you give me a time frame a little
(3) more precisely for that last portion of the conversation?
(4) THE WITNESS: How long that took?
(5) MR. PERRY: How long that took and on what days
(6) that occurred.
(7) THE WITNESS: It was on the day that I met with
(8) Mr. Barbour in his office and I couldn't give you an
(9) estimated amount of time. But I was very specific about
(10) that, for a lot of reasons. Having been in the Federal
(11) Government, I had lots of experience with loose chains of
(12) command and I wanted to understand precisely what it was and
(13) I think he made it very clear what it was.
(14) MR. PERRY: Let's let Howard identify himself.
(15) MR. SKLAMBERG: I'm Howard Sklamberg with the
(16) minority.
(17) BY MS. ROSENBERG:
(18) Q: On the 501(c)(4) status, were you surprised that
(19) NPF - was it your understanding that the 501(c)(4) status
(20) application was still pending?
(21) A: Yes. We discussed the fact that the application
(22) had been made, that the IRS had made a supplemental request
(23) for information. We discussed Mr. Barbour's opinion why the
(24) application had not been granted. He explained that both
(25) the organizational matters relating to the founding of NPF

Page 20

(1) and the filing of the application had been reviewed
(2) extensively by counsel, that counsel was confident that both
(3) the organizational and operational tests had been met.

(4) Q: This was counsel for NPF?

(5) A: Counsel for NPF, and that the application would be
(6) granted.

(7) At some point after that, I reviewed the articles
(8) of incorporation and other documents to satisfy myself that
(9) it met the purpose test and I believed that it did.

(10) Q: Were you surprised that the application seemed to
(11) be taking a long time, the granting of 501(c)(4) status?

(12) A: No, it's been my experience, and I spoke to
(13) friends of mine who were tax lawyers, that sometimes the IRS
(14) takes an extraordinarily long time to make up its mind.

(15) Q: So you weren't concerned about this -

(16) A: Well, I would have preferred that the application
(17) be granted as soon as possible, absolutely, but knowing the
(18) way the IRS functions and how slow it can be and how
(19) inefficient it can be, it didn't surprise me.

(20) Q: Did you have - this is jumping ahead a little
(21) bit - did you have any other dealings with the IRS on
(22) 501(c)(4) status while you were president of NPF?

(23) A: Well, I had one or two conversations with one of
(24) the staff attorneys who was handling the application
(25) sometime in 1995. The conversation was, in both cases, I

Page 21

(1) think very briefly, essentially along the lines of "Where
(2) are you?" The answer was equally brief: "Well, we're still
(3) working on it."

(4) There was a second supplemental request for
(5) information from the IRS in late '95 or early '96 and I
(6) didn't deal directly with the IRS about that but I
(7) participated in preparing the NPF response.

(8) Q: What type of information were they requesting?

(9) A: Well, I don't have the document but it was
(10) materials about what NPF's activities had been in 1995.
(11) That included the 10 or 11 megaconferences that NPF had
(12) conducted in Washington on a range of issues, policy
(13) issues - telecommunications, international trade, health
(14) care, a range of things like that. I'm sure you have at
(15) least some of that documentation.

(16) We provided copies of Common Sense, the quarterly
(17) publication. We provided copies of the NPF Newsletter and
(18) other documentation like that. I think we updated
(19) information on who was a member of the NPF board of
(20) directors, that sort of thing.

(21) Q: And did you prepare that information or did your
(22) counsel -

(23) A: I participated. Counsel for NPF made the final
(24) submission and was overall responsible for putting it
(25) together.

Page 22

(1) Q: Who was counsel for NPF at that time?

(2) A: Well, the first counsel for NPF was Linda Long,
(3) who left her law firm, the Blank, Rome law firm, in late '95
(4) because of personal illness. She was replaced by Tim Fry of
(5) that firm and I believe it was Mr. Fry who was responsible
(6) for putting together the response to the second IRS
(7) supplemental request.

(8) Q: Getting back to the discussion you were having
(9) with Haley Barbour, the first discussion about you becoming
(10) president of NPF, did he tell you at that time that NPF was
(11) in debt?

(12) A: He was there a debt; some money was owed to Signet
(13) Bank; some money was owed to the RNC. He expressed
(14) confidence that money would be paid to pay it off.

(15) Q: Did you know how much was owed to Signet Bank?

(16) A: I don't recall if he mentioned a figure or not.

(17) Q: And do you recall if he mentioned the figure that
(18) was owed to the RNC?

(19) A: I don't recall.

(20) Q: Did he tell you anything in detail at all about
(21) the Signal Bank loan at that first meeting?

(22) A: I think what I recall is that he mentioned that a
(23) loan had - that NPF had a debt to the RNC, that he had
(24) decided at some point in 1994 to take out a bank loan to pay
(25) off part of that debt and that that explained why there

Page 23

(1) were, in effect, two debts - a debt to Signet and a smaller
(2) debt that remained to the RNC.

(3) Q: During that first conversation with Haley Barbour,
(4) did he tell you anything about the particulars of the Signet
(5) Bank loan; in other words, that there was a guarantee made
(6) by Young Brothers?

(7) A: There was no discussion about the specifics of the
(8) loan. There was no mention of Young Brothers or a
(9) guarantee.

(10) Q: During that first conversation where you testified
(11) that Haley Barbour said that he would take the bulk of the
(12) fund-raising responsibilities, what did you understand that
(13) to mean? What was he going to do as far as fund-raising?

(14) A: That he would be the person who did most of the
(15) asking for contributions. He explained that NPF did not do
(16) direct mail fund-raising, like many other think-tanks do,
(17) and that he was not eager to get involved in that. And he
(18) said that he had intended that he would be the principal
(19) fund-raiser and that he would continue that.

(20) I had told him, as I mentioned earlier, that I had
(21) essentially no fund-raising experience and that I wanted him
(22) to understand that before I undertook the job.

(23) Q: During that first meeting with Haley Barbour
(24) sometime in November, did he offer you the job on the spot?

(25) A: Yes, I believe so.

Page 24

(1) Q: And did you accept it?

(2) A: I did not, no.

(3) Q: When did you accept Mr. Barbour's offer?

(4) A: Shortly before Christmas, I believe. I was before
(5) the first of the year.

(6) Q: Christmas of '94?

(7) A: '94.

(8) Q: Did you have any other meetings with Mr. Barbour
(9) before accepting his offer?

(10) A: I don't think we had any other meetings. I think
(11) we had another conversation or two on the phone.

(12) Q: And do you recall what you discussed in the phone
(13) conversations before you accepted the offer?

(14) A: I think one thing that I had mentioned in the
(15) meeting that I wanted to be clear with him about was that I
(16) would be able to continue to practice law during my tenure
(17) at NPF, which he agreed to. Obviously NPF would be the
(18) priority and, as for any lawyer, there would be no conflict
(19) of interest question that came up. I didn't think there
(20) would be. I don't think there ever was, but I wanted to
(21) just be sure he understood that for me, that was a
(22) prerequisite to accepting the position, and he agreed with
(23) that.

(24) Q: Did you, during those phone conversations, give
(25) him any idea of how much time you would be spending

Page 25

(1) practicing law versus how much time you would be able to
(2) spend at NPF?

(3) A: We didn't really discuss it in terms of time. I
(4) made the commitment to him that whatever my responsibilities
(5) were at NPF, that those would be fulfilled and the law
(6) practice would be in addition to that.

(7) Q: Was your salary adjusted based on the fact that
(8) you continued to practice law?

(9) A: The salary was fixed, was at his offer, and was to
(10) do the job necessary to be done at NPF, and he agreed to
(11) that.

(12) Q: Were there any other salary alterations or payment
(13) adjustments with the law firm when you went to work for NPF?

(14) MR. PERRY: I'm not sure that's really within the
(15) scope of our investigation.

(16) THE WITNESS: I think that's my personal business,
(17) quite frankly.

(18) BY MS. ROSENBERG:

(19) Q: So you're refusing to answer the question?

(20) MR. PERRY: His personal law firm stuff is so far
(21) outside our scope that it's insulting.

(22) MS. ROSENBERG: Excuse me, Phil. I don't believe
(23) you're representing this client.

(24) MR. PERRY: No, I'm not, but I'm representing the
(25) integrity of the committee and that's an improper question.

Page 26

[1] MS. ROSENBERG: Phil, I'll ask the witness the
[2] questions and let him decide whether he wants to answer.
[3] THE WITNESS: I'm not going to answer that
[4] question because I don't think it has any pertinence to your
[5] inquiry.
[6] MR. PERRY: Our job is not to probe people's
[7] personal financial information.
[8] BY MS. ROSENBERG:
[9] Q: Did you discuss your employment or pending
[10] employment at NPF with anyone else at NPF before you
[11] accepted in December of 1994?
[12] A: No.
[13] Q: Haley Barbour was the only NPF person that you
[14] talked to about it?
[15] A: That's correct.
[16] Q: And then you decided to accept the offer, as you
[17] said, sometime in December of 1994. Did you have any other
[18] meetings with Haley Barbour or did you just make a phone
[19] call and tell him you accepted?
[20] A: As I think I testified a minute ago, I think we
[21] had another couple of phone conversations and that was it.
[22] There were no more meetings that I remember.
[23] Q: When you first came on, then, in January of '95,
[24] what did you understand the mission of NPF to be?
[25] A: The tasks that Haley had in mind for NPF are

Page 27

[1] actually contained in some detail in an article in Common
[2] Sense, the first issue of Common Sense after I took over,
[3] called "The Mission of the National Policy Forum" in 1995,
[4] and feel free to take a look at that. It was basically to
[5] conduct megaconferences, to begin the work on the book that
[6] eventually became Agenda for America, to continue to publish
[7] Common Sense and to otherwise engage in activities typical
[8] of think-tanks in Washington.
[9] Q: When you first came on in January of '95, did you
[10] make any staff changes at NPF?
[11] A: Well, there were some staff changes that were
[12] being made, in effect, by people who were leaving at the
[13] time and I brought some additional people in, not
[14] necessarily in January, but I began at that point to
[15] assemble my own management team and to make changes, yes.
[16] Q: Out of who you consider the senior staff that were
[17] already in place when you came on, did any of the senior
[18] staff leave after you came on or around the time period that
[19] you started at NPF?
[20] A: Yes, Kelly Guesnier, who had been in charge of
[21] fund-raising in '93 and '94, had either already announced or
[22] announced shortly after I arrived that she was leaving, and
[23] I replaced her with Grace Wiggins and Diane Harrison.
[24] Mary Crawford, who had been in charge of public
[25] affairs, also left about that time and I replaced her with

Page 28

[1] Fran Westner.
[2] Common Sense, at that point, the editorship was
[3] vacant. I think Judy van Rest had already left and I filled
[4] that position with Cary Weil.
[5] And a little bit longer after that, I replaced -
[6] I eliminated Denning and Denning's position and created a
[7] new position which I think was originally called vice
[8] president for policy and later just vice president, with
[9] Jackie Wolcott.
[10] Q: Did the staff overall increase or decrease around
[11] the time period you started?
[12] A: It had been decreasing, as I understand it,
[13] beginning in basically the summer of 1994. With all of the
[14] changes that were being made, I think it basically
[15] stabilized around March or April at a level perhaps one or
[16] two people below where it was on January 1, 1995.
[17] Q: About how many people were on staff at that time?
[18] A: There were about 20, 25 at that point. There were
[19] other people I let go at what I would call below the senior
[20] staff level at about that time, as well.
[21] Q: It's my understanding, and correct me if I'm
[22] wrong, that around the time that you came on to NPF or
[23] shortly thereafter, NPF was transitioning from doing a lot
[24] of grassroots forums throughout the country to moving into
[25] the space of what you describe as megaconferences; is that

Page 29

[1] correct?
[2] A: I don't know that I would call it transitioning.
[3] I think, as Haley described it to me, that phase was over.
[4] His idea for '95-'96 was as I described and as I laid out in
[5] that Common Sense article and that's what we began to do in
[6] January of '95.
[7] Q: So the megaconferences were Haley Barbour's idea;
[8] is that correct?
[9] A: It wasn't a completely formed idea but his notion
[10] was that major policy conferences in Washington on currently
[11] topical policy issues was what he wanted NPF to do, and I
[12] concurred in that.
[13] Q: Had you discussed that idea or notion of major
[14] policy conferences in Washington prior to you starting at
[15] NPF?
[16] A: Yes, I think we discussed it at the meeting in his
[17] office.
[18] Q: And you agreed that that was a good idea?
[19] A: I thought it was a great idea.
[20] Q: Who did you answer to at NPF? Who was your
[21] supervisor?
[22] A: I answered to Haley as chairman of the board.
[23] Q: Anyone else?
[24] A: No.
[25] Q: And who was immediately below you?

Page 30

[1] A: Jackie Wolcott.
[2] Q: Anyone else?
[3] A: After I removed Denning, she was the vice
[4] president.
[5] Q: On policy decisions that the NPF made, who was
[6] ultimately responsible for those decisions?
[7] A: Haley and me.
[8] Q: Haley and you together?
[9] A: Sometimes I made them by myself. Sometimes we
[10] made them together. Sometimes he made them. The two of us
[11] made them, one way or the other.
[12] Q: And financial issues at NPF, who was ultimately
[13] responsible for those decisions?
[14] A: Haley and I discussed budget questions on a
[15] regular basis, discussed the conferences we were going to
[16] do, discussed Agenda for America, things like that, so that
[17] he was well aware of what we were doing. We were very
[18] closely in touch on the program of work on a regular basis.
[19] Q: How often did you talk to Haley Barbour when you
[20] were working at NPF?
[21] A: I think it's very hard to give you an average but
[22] whenever I needed to, basically.
[23] Q: And you would just call him?
[24] A: Call him or go over and see him, sure.
[25] Q: He did not have an office at NPF; is that correct?

Page 31

[1] A: No, that's correct.
[2] Q: So you would have to reach him at the RNC?
[3] A: Or on the road or in Mississippi or wherever.
[4] Q: Were you usually able to reach Haley Barbour
[5] directly or did you have to talk to his staff?
[6] A: Well, sometimes I talked to Barbara, his
[7] secretary, or Molly or Kirk or other people over there,
[8] Sanford McAllister sometimes, because he was on the road,
[9] and I'd say, "Tell Haley X," and they would pass it on and
[10] then they would - Barbara, for example, would call me or
[11] call Jackie and tell us what the response was.
[12] Q: And you mentioned a couple of first names.
[13] A: Holly Salatch was an assistant. Kirk Blalock was
[14] an assistant. Barbara Ehrenrich was an assistant. Sanford
[15] McAllister was his chief of staff at the RNC.
[16] Q: Other than the individuals you just named, was
[17] there anyone else at the RNC that you talked to on a regular
[18] basis?
[19] A: Not on a regular basis, no.
[20] Q: Was there anyone else at the RNC that you talked
[21] to occasionally?
[22] A: During the course of two years? Sure. I'm sure I
[23] ran into and said hello to probably 100 people at different
[24] times during the course -
[25] Q: Let me clarify the question. Was there anyone

Page 32

(1) else at the RNC you talked to about NPF business?
(2) A: During the first six or seven months of 1995, NPF
(3) did a television program called Listening to America. We
(4) used the RNC as a vendor, in effect, paid them a commercial
(5) rate for the use of the TV studio and some of their
(6) personnel to produce the show. Fran Westner was basically
(7) in charge of that relationship but from time to time I spoke
(8) with other people over there about it.
(9) Q: Other than the individuals that you named that
(10) were Haley Barbour's assistants or worked with Haley Barbour
(11) in dealing with the individual you named in dealing with the
(12) Listening to America television program, is there anyone
(13) else at the RNC that you spoke to about NPF business?
(14) A: There were a lot of people that I had
(15) conversations with where I would mention NPF because that's
(16) where I worked and that's what I talked to everybody about.
(17) Let me make it very clear. I didn't take any
(18) orders or any direction or any suggestions or any guidance
(19) or anything from anybody at the RNC.
(20) MR. PERRY: Is that also true of the NPF staff?
(21) THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge. If I
(22) had known anything else, I would have fired them.
(23) BY MS. ROSENBERG:
(24) Q: Did you bring on any new board members at the time
(25) you started at NPF?

Page 33

(1) A: Well, it wouldn't have been for me to bring them
(2) on. I was elected to the board so I guess I should count
(3) myself. I believe that Congressman Boehner also joined the
(4) board at the same time I did, and I think that's it.
(5) Q: And did you recommend Congressman Boehner to the
(6) board or did -
(7) A: No, I think that was a recommendation Haley had
(8) concluded before I came on. I believe that both my election
(9) and Congressman Boehner's election were at the January '95
(10) board meeting.
(11) Q: Do you still have the minutes to the board
(12) meetings?
(13) A: No, I do not.
(14) Q: I'm assuming there were minutes of the board
(15) meetings and you had them at one time.
(16) A: They were in the NPF files.
(17) Q: After starting at NPF, what was your role as far
(18) as developing policy, NPF policy?
(19) A: Well, a lot of what NPF did was try to encourage
(20) discussion of major policy issues. It was our view -
(21) there's an analogy in political science in the American
(22) political system, and I forget the author of it but it's a
(23) very good analogy that says the American political system is
(24) really not a two-party system; it's a one-and-a-half-party
(25) system. It describes it as the sun and the moon. There's

Page 34

(1) one dominant party that's intellectually dominant and the
(2) other party tends to be a pale reflection of it.
(3) It was my view in 1995-1996 that the Republican
(4) Party was the intellectual sun in that metaphor and a lot of
(5) what we were trying to do was encourage debate among
(6) Republicans on a variety of policy issues.
(7) So it was not so much we were setting policy as
(8) such as it was encouraging debate. And just as an example
(9) of that, the first megaconference we did was on
(10) telecommunications reform and there were a number of
(11) different positions that different lawmakers had. Different
(12) policy analysts had different positions. But essentially it
(13) was an argument about the extent and speed and nature of
(14) telecommunications deregulation. In other words, the debate
(15) was no longer increased regulation versus decreased
(16) regulation. The debate was how to deregulate, which we
(17) considered a fundamentally conservative or Republican
(18) debate.
(19) And we thought that airing the various points of
(20) view about that sort of thing was something very positive we
(21) could do. It contributed or we hoped it would contribute to
(22) the recreation of that intellectual ferment in the
(23) Republican circles that I mentioned before.
(24) MR. PERRY: When was that particular forum?
(25) THE WITNESS: It was in February or March of '95.

Page 35

(1) I don't recall at this time. It was the first one, the
(2) first megaconference.
(3) BY MS. ROSENBERG:
(4) Q: And your role in shaping the telecommunications
(5) debate that you just described -
(6) A: Well, I was overall in charge of putting together
(7) the structure of the conference and making the final
(8) decisions on who would participate on the panels, who the
(9) speakers would be, how we would structure the issues that
(10) the panels were to discuss, and that sort of thing.
(11) Q: Would you have been the person who I think you
(12) described would have shaped the debate as to how to
(13) deregulate versus how to slow regulation?
(14) A: I wish I could take credit for it but I think that
(15) would be reaching a little bit. No, that was - each of the
(16) different megaconferences had a different subject. Each we
(17) tried to craft in a different way to highlight what we
(18) thought the particular pertinent issues were, and I would
(19) have been very much involved in that.
(20) Q: Who else would have been involved in this
(21) discussion?
(22) A: Others in the NPF staff - Haley, to a certain
(23) extent. He was very involved in telecommunications because
(24) it was our first one; it was an issue he was personally
(25) interested in. I think it's fair to say that he wanted to

Page 36

(1) be sure that the first one was a success. But I think as
(2) time went on, fairly quickly, the level of his participation
(3) in putting together the megaconferences went down very
(4) substantially.
(5) Q: Do you recall who the panelists were in the
(6) telecommunications conference?
(7) A: Well, I recall some of them. The opening speaker
(8) was Jay Keyworth, who had been President Reagan's science
(9) adviser. The closing speaker, who was originally intended
(10) to be a luncheon speaker, which was the pattern we generally
(11) followed, was Senator Dole, which I was very pleased at. I
(12) remember from my days at the Justice Department in the mid-
(13) 1980s when the United States was the only major
(14) industrialized country to have its telecommunications policy
(15) run by a Federal District Court judge, that Senator Dole had
(16) been one of the first people to propose legislation to get
(17) us out of that particular conundrum. He had been involved
(18) in telecommunications reform from the beginning. He was
(19) obviously the majority leader of the Senate. We thought it
(20) was great for NPF to get him involved in that first
(21) conference.
(22) In terms of the panels, we really established the
(23) pattern there that we hoped to follow in all the subsequent
(24) megaconferences, which was that we wanted a very high-level
(25) public discussion among key members of Congress who would

Page 37

(1) actually be involved in shaping the policy concerning
(2) telecommunications deregulation and major corporate
(3) decisions-makers and leaders of people interested in the
(4) policy decisions that would result.
(5) We thought that that kind of discussion would be
(6) most appealing to what we considered our natural
(7) constituency, which was the members of the NPF policy
(8) committees, various interested parties and think-tanks,
(9) academic and press around town, and we thought it would
(10) provoke a very high level of discussion. And I think, by
(11) and large, that turned out to be correct.
(12) At telecommunications we had Senator Packwood,
(13) Senator Pressler. We had the chairman of the House
(14) Telecommunications - Jack Brooks, chairman of the House
(15) subcommittee that had jurisdiction. We had, I think, a
(16) number of other members of Congress, and we had a number of
(17) industry CEOs or other top corporate management.
(18) The speakers and the rough order of the panels at
(19) all the megaconferences were contained in one-page hand-outs
(20) that were given to everybody as they came in. We had a file
(21) of those at NPF and I believe it was stored at the time we
(22) basically closed it down. You may well have copies of it.
(23) Q: Do you recall any of the CEOs that were panelists?
(24) A: Gerald Levin from Time-Warner. I believe the head
(25) of the Southern Company. We had an executive, I think, from

Page 38

(1) Bell South. We had a senior executive on the international
(2) side of AT&T. We had, I think, the CEO of MCI. And there
(3) were others, as well.

(4) I may say I haven't reviewed any documents in
(5) connection with this deposition and I did not participate in
(6) or see any of the documents that I had read in the newspaper
(7) NPF has produced to you.

(8) Q: I understand this is all to the best of your
(9) recollection and I appreciate that.

(10) Of the guests at that teleconference that you just
(11) named the CEOs, the panelists, did you personally invite
(12) those CEOs? Did someone else invite them?

(13) A: Personally in the sense that I probably sent out
(14) letters to each of them, either confirming their
(15) participation or putting the formal invitation on a piece of
(16) paper to get it into their respective corporate decision-
(17) making systems.

(18) How they were individually approached, you know,
(19) varied with each individual and each conference. I could
(20) try and answer that on sort of an individual by individual
(21) basis but it was whatever - the same way you try to invite
(22) anybody to a conference. It's to find the best person who
(23) can persuade them that this is something they want to do.

(24) Q: Did you have any personal or professional contacts
(25) with any of the panelists, either at the telecommunications

Page 39

(1) conference or any others?

(2) A: Personal or professional over what period? My
(3) entire professional career?

(4) Q: Recent personal or professional, around the time
(5) of - say within a few years of the time you started working
(6) at NPF.

(7) A: Well, I don't think I had any personal or
(8) professional contact with any of the noncongressional
(9) people. Senator Pressler I had known because he was on the
(10) Senate Foreign Relations Committee and I was at the State
(11) Department.

(12) Senator Packwood I had dealt with when I was at
(13) the Justice Department in a variety of contexts, I think to
(14) a lesser extent when I was at the State Department.

(15) Congressman Brooks I had not met until shortly
(16) before the megaconference. I met with him in his office to
(17) discuss the conference. That was a case where I invited him
(18) specifically right there to testify.

(19) Senator Dole I had known for many years. My first
(20) wife worked for him.

(21) Jay Keyworth I had known when he was science
(22) adviser to President Reagan. That's it of those I remember.

(23) Q: And I believe you testified that at least at that
(24) first megaconference - well, maybe you didn't testify to
(25) this - did you personally or professionally know any of the

Page 40

(1) CEOs?

(2) A: I did not. I think I previously testified I did
(3) not know any of them.

(4) Q: Did you know any of the CEOs personally or
(5) professionally at any of the other megaconferences?

(6) A: I don't think so. Not all of the participants at
(7) the subsequent megaconferences were CEOs. Not all of them
(8) were CEOs at the first one. And there were certainly
(9) panelists that I knew in subsequent megaconferences from my
(10) own background, but I don't recall that I knew any of the
(11) other CEOs.

(12) MS. ROSENBERG: Why don't we take a 10-minute
(13) break?

(14) [Recess.]

(15) BY MS. ROSENBERG:

(16) Q: Mr. Bolton, we were talking about, before we took
(17) a break, about the megaconferences and panelists and how
(18) they were invited to be panelists. You testified that you
(19) had some involvement in inviting panelists but that there
(20) were other ways that panelists came to be on the forums.

(21) Can you describe how else panelists were invited,
(22) who else was involved in the decision-making?

(23) A: Well, I think the staff of NPF, particularly the
(24) policy council directors, who were familiar with the
(25) substantive issues, knew who some of the most articulate

Page 41

(1) spokespeople for various perspective in respective
(2) substantive areas were, and they had ideas. We would speak
(3) with - policy council directors would speak with Senate and
(4) House staff members who were substantive experts in these
(5) things. Sometimes I would talk to members of Congress or
(6) staff people about that. I knew a lot of people in the kind
(7) of think-tank community around Washington that I would talk
(8) to. And it was a very - we tried to cast the net very
(9) broadly because we were looking for people who were
(10) articulate, who could provide the kind of perspectives that
(11) we wanted.

(12) One thing we found was that frequently - I don't
(13) know about frequently - one thing we found was that there
(14) were times when it was difficult to get corporate
(15) spokespeople because they feared regulatory retaliation. So
(16) we also used representatives of trade associations or
(17) academics and think-tank persons. There was no one correct
(18) formula for each megaconference. Each one was constructed
(19) on its own.

(20) Q: You said that corporate spokespeople feared
(21) regulatory retaliation?

(22) A: Some corporate officials - for example, we did a
(23) conference on the Food and Drug Administration and because
(24) many of the industry people had applications for new drug
(25) permits or were seeking other kinds of regulatory approval,

Page 42

(1) they were concerned that being publicly visible criticizing
(2) the FDA, its commissioners, its procedures, might risk the
(3) pending applications that their companies had.

(4) We received many of the same comments from people
(5) concerned about EPA and some of the other regulatory
(6) agencies, as well.

(7) Q: Was it difficult to get panelists?

(8) A: It was harder than I thought it would have been.
(9) Certainly in terms of the high level that we were seeking,
(10) schedules get filled up well in advance and scheduling was
(11) always a major concern for us, given the congressional work
(12) schedule, recess schedule and so on, in an effort to be
(13) timely in connection with when we did different subjects and
(14) that sort of thing.

(15) So when you look at all of the - I mean, even
(16) down to the nitty-gritty of which hotel could we reserve at
(17) which time and where was it going to be and that sort of
(18) thing, it was a very complex calculus to put these together.

(19) Q: You said you made an effort to be timely in the
(20) conferences. How would you define timely?

(21) A: Well, things that were either issues that were
(22) ripe for public discussion or that were about to be. For
(23) example, we did one megaconference in - I guess it was late
(24) '95 or early '96 on public utility deregulation and concepts
(25) like retail wheeling and competition among distribution and

Page 43

(1) provision of electrical power, which was really before that
(2) had come up very much on the public radar screen. That was
(3) something that I was particularly happy to do because we
(4) thought that was the sort of thing where, to go back to my
(5) sun and moon metaphor, where we could have an early
(6) discussion on that.

(7) Telecommunications, in '95, I think most people
(8) felt that '95 would be the year in which Congress enacted
(9) major telecommunications reform. It turned out it didn't
(10) happen until 1996 but we wanted to present the issues very
(11) early in that debate, as well. That's a sort of typical
(12) example.

(13) Q: Was the timing of megaconferences ever determined
(14) by things that were actually happening on Capitol Hill -
(15) hearings or legislation?

(16) A: No. It would have been too hard to calibrate.

(17) These were big events, which is why we called them
(18) megaconferences.

(19) Q: How was the budget of the megaconferences
(20) determined?

(21) A: Well, in the first one we had certain things that
(22) were sort of fixed. We knew what the rent for the hall
(23) would be at the Renaissance Hotel. We knew things like
(24) that. And then, after that, we had a pretty good idea what
(25) the cost for setting up would be, what the cost of lunch

Page 44

(1) that we usually provided would be, the cost of transcription
(2) services, the lighting, the sound system and all those
(3) various things.

(4) And the budget didn't vary that much during the 15
(5) or so that we did after that. It was pretty well known,
(6) within some variation.

(7) Q: And what was that? Do you recall?

(8) A: The average would have been between 35 and
(9) \$50,000.

(10) Q: And how did NPF pay for the megaconferences?

(11) A: From the general treasury that we had, from the
(12) funds that were in the general treasury.

(13) Q: So, in other words, the normal solicitations for
(14) contributions would have been used to pay for the
(15) megaconferences?

(16) A: That's correct. What we did, in part, was that we
(17) thought people who had an interest in the subject matter of
(18) the conference might be willing to make a contribution, and
(19) we talked to them about the work of NPF, talked to them
(20) about the nature of its mission and what we were doing, and
(21) solicited their support. Sometimes they made a
(22) contribution; sometimes they didn't.

(23) Q: Did you view the megaconferences themselves as
(24) fund-raising events?

(25) A: No, no, not in the sense that you think of selling

Page 45

(1) tickets at a table or anything like that; not at all. They
(2) were, I think, useful as examples of some of the work NPF
(3) was doing in the policy arena. We also talked about the
(4) television show; we talked about Common Sense; we talked
(5) about Agenda for America that I was in the process of
(6) writing. Later we talked a little bit about the work we
(7) were doing on the presidential transition effort.

(8) Things like that. In other words, the work that
(9) NPF was doing, we hoped to show to companies that it was
(10) something that was worth supporting.

(11) Q: Did NPF ever have fund-raising events, as I think
(12) you described it - selling tickets or -

(13) A: Not selling tickets. We had a couple or three
(14) receptions, all of which, I think, were in 1995. I'm
(15) thinking of two specifically where we invited people who
(16) were Washington representatives of different companies,
(17) different trade associations, professional people in
(18) Washington.

(19) The two that I'm thinking of, Haley and Speaker
(20) Gingrich both spoke. I spoke a little bit. I introduced
(21) them, mostly. They spoke about the work of NPF and what NPF
(22) was doing.

(23) Q: Do you recall when those receptions took place?

(24) A: I believe they were in the spring or summer of
(25) '95. There may have been one other. I can recall

Page 46

(1) physically being at two. There may have been one or two
(2) others.

(3) Q: Where did they take place - the receptions take
(4) place?

(5) A: One took place at the Capitol Hill Club. One took
(6) place at a restaurant down the street from NPF's
(7) headquarters on Pennsylvania Avenue.

(8) Q: And how many people attended those receptions?

(9) A: Twenty or 25. We decided - I guess this was
(10) mostly mine and Haley's decision - not to pursue that
(11) because it didn't seem to be a very effective way to do it.
(12) I personally don't enjoy that sort of thing that much so I
(13) was not at all unhappy to abandon that style.

(14) Q: Were they effective fund-raisers at all?

(15) A: I don't think so, no.

(16) Q: Were the guests for those receptions

(17) representatives of one particular industry or a particular
(18) industry, say, for each reception?

(19) A: No, in some cases they were representatives of
(20) companies that had already made a contribution. In some
(21) cases they were companies we'd talked to. In other cases
(22) they were just people we thought might be interested in
(23) NPF's work. It was kind of a fairly wide variety.

(24) Largely I would describe it as Washington
(25) representative-type people.

Page 47

(1) Q: And do you recall how individuals managed to get
(2) on the guest list for these receptions?

(3) A: I think some were in the files, as I say, as
(4) companies that had already contributed; some were people we
(5) had approached; others were people who were involved in
(6) industries that we had either done a megaconference on or
(7) were contemplating doing a megaconference on who we thought
(8) would be interested in NPF's work. That sort of legwork and
(9) research, if you will, was done by Grace Wiggins when she
(10) was there and Diane Harrison.

(11) A lot of people were suggested by others that we
(12) or they already knew and they said, "Well, you should invite
(13) X and Y might be interested," and so on.

(14) Q: Did Haley Barbour make any suggestions as to who
(15) should be invited to the receptions?

(16) A: I'm sure he did, yeah. I don't recall any
(17) specifically but as part of the conversations he was having,
(18) he made suggestions about invitations to those receptions,
(19) people that I should see to follow up on to discuss NPF's
(20) work in more detail and that sort of thing.

(21) Q: And did you make any suggestions of any
(22) individuals to invite?

(23) A: I may well have. I don't recall any specifically.

(24) Q: Just a point of clarification, and I don't mean to
(25) be correcting you but your fund-raiser you keep referring to

Page 48

(1) as Grace Wiggins; is that her last name?

(2) A: I think she's Grace Cummings now.

(3) Q: I thought, in things I'd been reading, it was
(4) actually Weigers.

(5) A: Grace Weigers; I'm sorry.

(6) Q: I just wanted to clarify that for the record. I
(7) believe it's W-i-e-g-e-r-s, or e-i.

(8) A: E-i.

(9) Q: Okay. I just wanted to make sure we're talking
(10) about the same person when you mention her. Thanks.
(11) Were there any other fund-raising events besides
(12) these receptions you've described?

(13) A: I don't recall any others.

(14) Q: Getting back now to your role in various aspects
(15) of NPF, what was your role regarding production of the
(16) publications that NPF put out?

(17) A: Cary Weil was day to day in charge of producing
(18) Common Sense. I think her title was managing editor or
(19) something like that. I had overall responsibility for it.
(20) She did a very good job. I mostly let her do it. I would
(21) read the articles as they came in from time to time, decide
(22) on some, give her priorities, what I thought was important
(23) to include. But basically, she carried the work.

(24) Fran Westner did the newsletter. We'd talk about
(25) it, its preparation, but she was responsible for writing it

Page 49

(1) and putting it together.

(2) Q: Did you have any role in deciding who would
(3) contribute articles to any of the publications?

(4) A: Yes, I did, to Common Sense.

(5) Q: And what was that role? How did you decide?

(6) A: Sometimes we solicited articles from people that I
(7) thought would make for an interesting conversation.
(8) Sometimes articles came in and we had to make judgments
(9) whether they fit our editorial priorities. A variety of
(10) different things like that.

(11) Q: Were donors ever given the opportunity to submit
(12) an article in exchange for making a contribution?

(13) A: Not while I was there.

(14) Q: Who decided - or what was your role in deciding
(15) who would receive the various publications, either the
(16) newsletter or Common Sense?

(17) A: The newsletter went to the members of the policy
(18) councils, which was around 1,500 people roughly, went to
(19) contributors, one or two people per corporate contributor.
(20) It went to a press list and may have gone to some other
(21) people. That list - I've just described the categories -
(22) that list may have changed - those lists may have changed
(23) from time to time. The categories were basically set.

(24) We, from time to time, sent the newsletter to
(25) people who were potential contributors as a further

Page 50

(1) indication of what NPF was doing.
(2) Common Sense was mailed to a series of lists of
(3) between 15,000 and 18,000 people per quarterly issue and
(4) that list was compiled of all members of Congress,
(5) Republican and Democrat, Republican officeholders around the
(6) country, subscribers in academic libraries, university
(7) libraries and others around the country, media lists, things
(8) like that. It was basically the same list that was mailed
(9) over and over again. It went to all the members of the
(10) policy council - Common Sense went to all the members of
(11) the policy councils. It went to contributors. That's
(12) basically about it.
(13) Q: Did you ever charge anyone for copies of Common
(14) Sense?
(15) A: We would have loved to have made Common Sense a
(16) profit-making operation. We did have a subscription rate.
(17) It was a relatively small number of subscribers, mostly
(18) university libraries, that sort of thing.
(19) We discussed, from time to time, making it a cost
(20) center in and of itself and, for a variety of reasons,
(21) concluded that it was never quite right to do that.
(22) Q: So the groups or individuals you just named who
(23) received Common Sense, they got it for free?
(24) A: That's correct.
(25) Q: Did any of the political parties receive Common

Page 51

(1) Sense?
(2) A: I don't think we sent anything to the political
(3) parties. We sent, as I said, we sent an issue to every
(4) member of Congress, all 535, and many of the staffs, staff
(5) directors and that sort of thing, received their own copies;
(6) members of policy councils who may have been party officials
(7) or that sort of thing.
(8) Q: And then you had another publication, if I
(9) remember correctly. That was the Listening to America
(10) publication, correct?
(11) A: Well, Listening to America was published in 1994
(12) in two versions, a long version and a short version, and
(13) that was before I got there. It was a one-time shot. It
(14) was not an on-going publication.
(15) Q: Were there any other publications while you were
(16) there?
(17) A: No, the newsletter and Common Sense were the two
(18) publications.
(19) Q: Getting back, then, to the megaconferences and
(20) talking more about the panels and how they were determined,
(21) were there steering committees at all to help recruit
(22) panelists?
(23) A: We had, on an ad hoc basis, sometimes people who
(24) we considered knowledgeable about the particular topic -
(25) sometimes congressional staff members; mostly it was

Page 52

(1) internal NPF staff - who were involved in doing it,
(2) sometimes people from the policy councils, but the kind of
(3) workaday responsibility was NPF's.
(4) Q: And when elected officials, members of Congress,
(5) were invited to the megaconferences, were they ever
(6) reimbursed for their expenses?
(7) A: No. We, from time to time, would have a van or a
(8) car to be able to bring them from Capitol Hill to the
(9) Renaissance Hotel, where most of them took place, to make
(10) sure they could get back for votes and that sort of thing,
(11) but many of them also came on their own and I don't believe
(12) we ever reimbursed them for cab fare or anything like that.
(13) Q: Was there ever honoraria?
(14) A: No, not for the megaconferences.
(15) Q: Was there ever honoraria for anything?
(16) A: Not while I was there; I don't believe so, no.
(17) Q: Were the megaconferences ever used as a vehicle
(18) for lobbying the Republican or Democratic members of
(19) Congress who might have been panelists?
(20) A: Not by NPF, no.
(21) Q: Are you aware that anyone might have lobbied, and
(22) I'll use that term loosely, the members of Congress who were
(23) panelists or guests at the megaconferences?
(24) A: Well, the purpose of the megaconference was to
(25) talk about the issues, and that's what was done in the

Page 53

(1) public forum. What they did when they walked off the stage,
(2) I don't know. But that wasn't part of our program.
(3) I might say we had sign-up sheets at all these
(4) megaconferences which were routinely attended by at least
(5) one or two people from the Democratic National Committee,
(6) and I don't know what they did, either.
(7) MR. PERRY: The conferences were certainly open to
(8) Democrats?
(9) THE WITNESS: They were open to anybody basically.
(10) BY MS. ROSENBERG:
(11) Q: Have you ever used any contacts from an NPF
(12) conference in your current lobbying or law practice?
(13) A: No.
(14) Q: Were the megaconferences broadcast on GOP-TV?
(15) A: I don't know the answer to that.
(16) Q: Were they broadcast anywhere?
(17) A: I don't know the answer to that. C-Span was there
(18) a couple of times. A number of TV networks came for
(19) different ones, for different purposes. Whether they were
(20) broadcast or not, I honestly don't know.
(21) Q: You had said that - earlier you testified that -
(22) A: I might say we had some TV footage done of some of
(23) them for the NPF TV show. So in that sense I believe at
(24) least small bits and pieces of them would have been
(25) broadcast.

Page 54

(1) Q: Could you tell me about the NPFTV show?
(2) A: It was a half an hour show broadcast once a month
(3) or six times. In the first six months of '95 we concluded
(4) that it was not cost-effective and we ended it after the six
(5) shows that Haley had committed to broadcast when he arranged
(6) to pick it up.
(7) Q: And how was that paid for?
(8) A: That would have been paid for out of the normal
(9) contributions, out of the general treasury.
(10) Q: And was it your testimony earlier - correct me if
(11) I'm wrong - that the RNC was somehow involved in the
(12) broadcast?
(13) A: We purchased the RNC's services as a vendor -
(14) their broadcast facility, their technical people and that
(15) sort of thing. We paid them a commercial fee for that and
(16) those receipts from the RNC - from NPF to the RNC were made
(17) basically on a show by show basis.
(18) Q: How did you establish the fee that NPF would pay
(19) RNC?
(20) A: Fran Westner talked to a number of people about
(21) what it might be. We had inquiries from some other people
(22) about doing the show, about producing it for us. She made
(23) some calls, I believe, to other possible producers. And the
(24) people at the RNC were told by their counsel, as ours was
(25) advising us, that the fee should be on a commercial basis.

Page 55

(1) Q: So to the best of your knowledge, the fee was
(2) roughly what you would have had to pay another producer?
(3) A: I believe that's correct.
(4) Q: So why did you choose the RNC?
(5) A: Because it was two blocks down the street and it
(6) was high quality and because Haley wanted to do that.
(7) Q: And do you know why Haley wanted to do that?
(8) A: Because it was two blocks down the street and it
(9) was high quality.
(10) Q: What can you tell me about NPF's involvement with
(11) the Republican Exchange Satellite Network?
(12) A: I believe that is the organization that
(13) transferred the TV show to NPF. That was negotiated
(14) basically before I came on board. In other words, the
(15) decision had been made to undertake this. I think the final
(16) documents were signed after I came on board. I think
(17) Denning actually signed them but it was a decision that was
(18) made before I showed up.
(19) Q: So you weren't involved in any of the decision-
(20) making process at all?
(21) A: No, not to take the show over.
(22) Q: Do you know what that means, to take the show
(23) over? Can you define that for me?
(24) A: Well, I think the RESN had the name to the show
(25) and had access to satellite broadcast channels. Now, I am

Page 56

(1) way over my head technically here and I feel very unsure
(2) even saying that, but they had some arrangement that existed
(3) whereby the satellites or the cable networks or whatever
(4) they were would transmit the show, and Haley had agreed to
(5) fulfill those obligations for a period of six monthly
(6) broadcasts, with the option to continue it further if he
(7) wanted to.

(8) Q: Do you know if there was any payment - I'm way
(9) over my head in discussing this satellite issue, as well,
(10) but do you know if there was payment for the right to
(11) broadcast - payment to RESN for the right to broadcast the
(12) shows or use their satellite?

(13) A: No. I believe when the transfer of the show was
(14) made there was no payment from NPF to RESN and there was no
(15) payment by NPF that I'm aware of to satellite owners or
(16) anything else. The only cost I was aware of to NPF was the
(17) cost of producing each of the six shows.

(18) Q: Did you ever receive contributions from
(19) individuals who saw the broadcast?

(20) A: I don't know the answer to that. I don't recall
(21) ever seeing a letter that said, "Gee, I saw the show and
(22) here's a check." I don't recall that. I don't believe that
(23) happened.

(24) Q: You mentioned that parts of megaconferences were
(25) sometimes broadcast. What else were the topics or themes of

Page 57

(1) the shows?

(2) A: Well, the tapes are somewhere in the NPF files.
(3) We did one on the environment. We did - we might have done
(4) two on the environment. We did one on foreign policy. I
(5) don't recall the other topics but they were of that kind,
(6) the broad policy discussions that would have been typical of
(7) the megaconferences. Frequently, when we were planning one
(8) of the shows, having in mind that we had just done a
(9) megaconference or that a megaconference was coming up, the
(10) topics were frequently related.

(11) Q: And who were the guests on the shows?

(12) A: The guests were some elected Republican officials,
(13) some people on the policy councils, different kinds of
(14) people like that. We had a couple of remote broadcasts.

(15) We had one on the environment with the governor of
(16) Mississippi, from Jackson, Mississippi. We had one from
(17) Little Rock with Lieutenant Governor, as he was then,
(18) Huckabee. We had one remote from Norfolk, Virginia from a
(19) couple of people who owned a laundry who were being
(20) harassed, in their view, by the EPA, which was a really good
(21) one, that sort of thing.

(22) We tried to have a variety of different guests so
(23) it wasn't all just - I was the host and we wanted to avoid
(24) having it entirely just people talking back and forth about
(25) policy issues, so we tried to do a little bit of that.

Page 58

(1) Haley was the host on the first one and I was the host on
(2) the other five.

(3) Q: Was it your first foray into television?

(4) A: I've done a lot of television but I was never a
(5) host before that.

(6) Q: Moving on to fund-raising at the National Policy
(7) Forum, was there a separate finance department at the
(8) National Policy Forum?

(9) A: Yes, there was.

(10) Q: And I believe you testified that when you came on,
(11) that would have been Grace Weigers and -

(12) A: She wasn't there. Kelly Guesnier was there and
(13) Heather El Haj was there. Kelly Guesnier then left and I
(14) brought Grace Weigers and Diane Harrison.

(15) Q: Did Heather El Haj stay on?

(16) A: She stayed on for over a year. She left sometime
(17) in the spring of 1996, I think.

(18) Q: And were you entirely responsible for hiring Grace
(19) Weigers and Diane Harrison?

(20) A: I talked to Haley about both of them. I think he
(21) either knew who they were or knew of them.

(22) Q: Had Haley said not to hire either one of them,
(23) would you have been able to -

(24) A: I would not have hired them.

(25) Q: And do you know if they were recommended as

Page 59

(1) potential fund-raisers?

(2) A: They were recommended by a number of people, yes.

(3) Q: Do you know who recommended them?

(4) A: I don't recall offhand. Having not had really

(5) very much experience myself, I wasn't in a position to make
(6) that judgment but the recommendations that did come in were
(7) sufficient to convince me at the time that they were
(8) competent to do the job. As I say, I talked to Haley about
(9) them and he either was comfortable enough, knowing them
(10) personally, or with the people who had recommended them,
(11) that he concurred.

(12) Q: Without getting into the identity of donors, how
(13) were the names of donors determined?

(14) A: Through a variety of different mechanisms -
(15) people who were on the policy councils and their business
(16) affiliations, people who made inquiry about the National
(17) Policy Forum, people who came to the megaconferences, people
(18) who we thought might be interested in the specific subjects
(19) that we were covering, and just from a general review of
(20) what we knew of goings-on in business and industry.

(21) Diane Harrison was a faithful daily reader of the
(22) Wall Street Journal, Fortune, Forbes, Business Week, that
(23) sort of thing, and she and I talked about people who might
(24) be potential contributors.

(25) Haley was probably the major source of names of

Page 60

(1) people who he spoke with.

(2) Q: And I know you testified earlier you had not done
(3) a lot of fund-raising - previously didn't have a lot of
(4) fund-raising experience, but did you eventually get involved
(5) in the fund-raising process at NPF?

(6) A: Sure. What I did was talk to prospective
(7) contributors about the work of NPF, described what we did in
(8) terms of the megaconferences, Common Sense, Agenda for
(9) America and the other things we were doing, tried to answer
(10) their questions about the structure of NPF, who was involved
(11) in it, that kind of thing.

(12) Q: You talked to prospective contributors in one-on-
(13) one meetings or over the phone? How did that work?

(14) A: Well, both, and from time to time, I would say
(15) beginning from the spring of 1995 through the end of 1996,
(16) often Diane Harrison and I would go to visit somebody in the
(17) Washington office, for example, of a corporation or trade
(18) association.

(19) I would basically explain the work of NPF, as I've
(20) said several times here today. Diane would be the kind of
(21) follow-up person to deal with whomever from the particular
(22) business or trade association who would be either the
(23) decision-maker or the point of contact for talking about the
(24) potential contribution.

(25) Q: How much of your time was spent on these fund-

Page 61

(1) raising meetings?

(2) A: It's very hard to put a percentage on it but it
(3) was a fraction of my total time.

(4) Q: On sort of a weekly basis, can you give me an
(5) estimate of how much time you would spend fund-raising?

(6) A: I'd be very leery about a percentage. I mean,
(7) there might be some weeks where we'd have four or five
(8) meetings. You know, you get in a cab and arrive at K Street
(9) and wait and meet for half an hour and get another cab and
(10) come back, and two or three times a day. But then there
(11) would be stretches where that wouldn't happen, as well.

(12) So I did not keep hourly time records and I'd be
(13) very reluctant to give a guess, but it was certainly a
(14) distinct minority.

(15) Q: And when you went on the fund-raising meetings,
(16) you said that Diane Harrison went with you. Did anybody
(17) else go with you?

(18) A: Very rarely. I can't even think of another time
(19) when others would have. She was responsible for fund-
(20) raising at NPF so it was very important to have her come
(21) along. People would get to know her and then she would be
(22) able to follow up with it.

(23) Q: Did Haley Barbour ever go with you on fund-raising
(24) calls?

(25) A: Not on calls that I went out to, the sort I've

Page 62

[1] described, no.
[2] Q: And Grace Weigers did not go with you?
[3] A: Grace wasn't there that long. She may have gone
[4] out on a couple. I don't mean to exclude her. I just don't
[5] recall one specifically.
[6] Q: And do you know who set up the fund-raising
[7] meetings?
[8] A: Typically Diane would have asked - Diane Harrison
[9] would have asked for the appointment.
[10] Q: Was there any reporting to Haley Barbour about the
[11] fund-raising at NPF?
[12] A: From time to time we would send him descriptions
[13] or I would talk to him on the phone of people I thought he
[14] personally should follow up with. Diane Harrison regularly
[15] put together a list of calls that we hoped he would make.
[16] On his travels around the country, you know, from a phone in
[17] an airport, he'd have the NPF list and take it out and call
[18] somebody. I think that describes it.
[19] Q: Do you know where Diane Harrison is now?
[20] A: She's in Kentucky, I believe.
[21] Q: How successful were fund-raising operations while
[22] you were there? Did you get responses from the majority of
[23] people, contributions from the majority of people you talked
[24] to?
[25] A: I don't think we ever did a rack-up that would

Page 63

[1] give an answer to that question. In 1995, the total
[2] receipts and total expenditures for the program and
[3] operating expenses of NPF were roughly equal.
[4] We had an increase in debt owed to the RNC that
[5] was almost exactly equal to the decrease in debt paid off to
[6] Signet. If you eliminate the payment of the Signet debt and
[7] the receipt of the additional loans from the RNC, take that
[8] out, what a company reporting would call its actual
[9] operating revenues and expenditures, we broke even in 1995
[10] at a level of about \$3 million, which was the highest level
[11] then to date, but basically we broke even.
[12] That didn't turn out to be the case in 1996. But
[13] I considered 1995, on that basis, having NPF gone into debt
[14] in 1993, gone into debt in 1994, my first year, in 1995, at
[15] least the net debt at the end of the year was no greater
[16] than it had been at the beginning of the year. It wasn't
[17] less, but it wasn't any greater.
[18] Q: Do you have any idea why the increase in debt to
[19] the RNC was comparable to the decrease in debt to Signet?
[20] A: It wasn't necessarily on a dollar for dollar
[21] basis. It wasn't intended to be, although loans from the
[22] RNC were used to pay the Signet debt. It just worked out,
[23] at the end of the year. It wasn't by design. It's just
[24] that's the way the numbers worked out.
[25] Q: How were contribution solicitations documented?

Page 64

[1] A: In virtually every case that I can think of that I
[2] met with somebody, we would follow it up with a letter that
[3] said, "Dr. Mr., it was a pleasure to meet with you," da-da-
[4] da-da-da and "here's what we're doing" and would perhaps
[5] contain some additional explanatory material about NPF,
[6] because that's the way most corporations or trade
[7] associations like to proceed. They like to have a document
[8] that they can put into their system.
[9] There were other fund-raising letters that we sent
[10] out without these meetings. There were other contacts that
[11] Haley and perhaps others made that would not necessarily
[12] have been documented like that in the NPF files.
[13] But whenever we had a meeting of the kind we've
[14] been talking about, almost invariably, we would follow that
[15] up with a letter.
[16] Q: Do you still have any of the letters?
[17] A: I don't have any of them. They're all in the NPF
[18] files. The finance files at NPF were kept separate from all
[19] the other files and when we left in December, those were all
[20] stored in the storehouse.
[21] Q: Was anyone at NPF - let me back up. Were there
[22] any potential donors that you would refuse to accept a
[23] contribution from?
[24] A: Were there any who came to us and said, "We want
[25] to give you money" that we refused?

Page 65

[1] Q: Yes.
[2] A: There weren't enough who came and said, "We want
[3] to give you money." I don't recall any cases where we
[4] returned a check. I don't recall any where somebody
[5] approached us and we turned them down.
[6] I've read Chairman Thompson's order and I
[7] certainly will abide by it but the bulk of the contributors,
[8] as I've said, and I would have said this in fund-raising
[9] meetings at the time, the bulk of the contributors were
[10] corporations whose names would be very familiar with you,
[11] trade associations, and a few individuals.
[12] So it was not a direct mail - there was not a
[13] large, piles and piles of checks coming in the door. It was
[14] a relatively small number.
[15] Q: Did NPF have a policy regarding contributions from
[16] foreign nationals or foreign-owned corporations?
[17] A: There was no policy but there were almost no such
[18] contributions.
[19] Q: Were there any?
[20] A: From foreign companies? Leaving the question of
[21] what you want to call Young Brothers Development out of it
[22] for a second, I was not aware of any contributions during my
[23] time at NPF from foreign corporations.
[24] Q: Are you aware of a contribution from an entity
[25] called the Pacific Cultural Foundation?

Page 66

[1] A: Yes, I was.
[2] Q: And would you describe that as a foreign
[3] corporation or -
[4] A: I don't know what its legal status was. It was
[5] not a for-profit corporation. It was like a think-tank.
[6] Q: And do you know where the Pacific Cultural
[7] Foundation's money came from? Was it U.S. money or did it
[8] come from outside the U.S.?
[9] A: I believe its principal source of receipts was
[10] non-U.S. money.
[11] Q: Were you or was anyone at NPF aware of that at the
[12] time they accepted the contribution?
[13] A: Jack Copeland, who was a person who actually
[14] solicited that contribution, I think was aware of it. We
[15] were aware that it was a Taiwanese entity but at the time,
[16] we believed at the time it was a not-for-profit entity.
[17] Q: And are you aware of any contributions from an
[18] organization called Panda Estates or Panda Industries?
[19] A: I was aware of that at the time it was made, yes.
[20] Q: Do you know who solicited that contribution?
[21] A: Joe Gaylord.
[22] Q: Who's Joe Gaylord?
[23] A: He is a political consultant in Washington, does a
[24] lot of work for the Speaker.
[25] Q: He does a lot of work for?

Page 67

[1] A: The Speaker of the House.
[2] Q: Speaker Gingrich?
[3] A: Yes.
[4] Q: And was there any question at the time that that
[5] contribution was solicited or that contribution came in
[6] about the source of funds?
[7] A: Yes, there was.
[8] Q: And what was the question?
[9] A: Well, I raised it. Gaylord was paid a consulting
[10] fee by NPF to raise money, which he wasn't doing. Panda
[11] Enterprises was the first contribution that came in under
[12] his auspices. There were three that came in together:
[13] Panda Enterprises, Mor - well, we're not going to - one
[14] investment banking firm and one law firm. Both the
[15] investment banking firm and the law firm were domestic U.S.
[16] entities whose names would be well known to you. I looked
[17] at Panda Enterprises and asked what it was.
[18] I might say also Gaylord getting this monthly fee,
[19] which I eventually convinced Haley to cut off, told us that
[20] the amount of these contributions had to be reduced by 10
[21] percent as a fee for the person who had actually raised
[22] them, which I didn't like, either.
[23] But anyway, looking at Panda Enterprises, I'd
[24] never heard of that operation and I asked - I think I asked
[25] Diane Harrison to find out who they were. And the response

Page 68

(1) from Gaylord was that it was a Hollywood entertainment
(2) company.
(3) Q: And you accepted that?
(4) A: We accepted that.
(5) Q: Do you recall how much that contribution was for?
(6) A: I think it was for \$50,000.
(7) Q: And do you recall how much the Pacific Cultural
(8) Foundation contribution was?
(9) A: I believe that was for \$25,000. Let me just
(10) clarify. We were not under any impression at the time that
(11) Panda Enterprises had any foreign connection whatever.
(12) Q: Did you know or had you heard of the name Ted
(13) Sicong in connection with that contribution?
(14) A: I had never heard that name before. I've seen it
(15) in the papers recently but until about three weeks ago, I
(16) had never heard that name.
(17) Q: And had you ever heard the name Jessica El
(18) Nitiarta?
(19) A: Not until I saw it in the paper a few weeks ago.
(20) It did strike me when I saw the name in the paper that she
(21) may have been the fund-raiser for whom Gaylord wanted the
(22) commission, in effect, but I don't recall that. I don't
(23) remember whether NPF sent this person a check or how that
(24) commission was handled, but I didn't like it because we were
(25) paying Gaylord for not raising contributions and when he

Page 69

(1) finally found some, we had to pay somebody else 10 percent.
(2) It was, to me, a - I didn't like it.
(3) Q: It doesn't seem to make much sense, does it?
(4) A: No, it sure didn't.
(5) Q: But in connection with the Panda check, it's your
(6) understanding that someone got a commission, in addition to
(7) Gaylord?
(8) A: Yes. Well, Gaylord didn't get a commission. He
(9) was getting a monthly fee.
(10) Q: And then someone else got the commission.
(11) A: On those three checks that came in at the same
(12) time.
(13) Q: Okay.
(14) A: This had been from some event on the West Coast
(15) that Gaylord had had some involvement with.
(16) Q: But you don't recall who received the commission?
(17) A: I don't recall the name.
(18) Q: You had said that Gaylord was affiliated with
(19) Speaker Gingrich. Do you know if he attended the event on
(20) the West Coast that you just mentioned?
(21) A: I don't know whether he did or not. I don't think
(22) I knew at the time.
(23) Q: Other than the two contributions we've just been
(24) discussing - Panda and Pacific Cultural Foundation - were
(25) you aware of any other foreign contributions to NPF,

Page 70

(1) excluding the Young Brothers?
(2) A: Leaving aside the question of what Panda
(3) Enterprises was, because I don't know to this day whether it
(4) was foreign or not, I am convinced that during my tenure,
(5) there were no other foreign contributions.
(6) Q: Were there any other contributions, like the Panda
(7) contribution, where you had not heard of the organization
(8) and questioned what it was?
(9) A: I think there were probably some corporate names
(10) that I didn't know but I think there was never anything that
(11) couldn't easily be identified as something that was either
(12) listed on an American stock exchange or was known to be
(13) family-owned or something like that, that I know of.
(14) Q: Was there ever an effort by NPF while you were
(15) there to raise money from foreign sources?
(16) A: No.
(17) Let me just say this, since I've read this in the
(18) newspapers, too, where I've learned so much in the past
(19) couple of weeks. I am completely unaware of any concerted
(20) effort or plan by anybody at any time to raise foreign money
(21) for NPF. I don't recall any discussions of it with Diane
(22) Harrison or Grace Weigers or anybody else.
(23) We were certainly looking for corporate and other
(24) support. We discussed potential contributions with a lot of
(25) corporations, but there was certainly no plan whatever that

Page 71

(1) I know of to raise any money in foreign contributions, let
(2) alone any substantial part of NPF's operating expenses.
(3) Q: Did you ever take any foreign travel while you
(4) were at NPF in your capacity as president of NPF?
(5) A: Well, I went on foreign trips where I was
(6) identified as the president of NPF which I was at the time,
(7) and there were some small parts of expenses on those trips
(8) that I billed to NPF. But I believe that all of the foreign
(9) trips I took were either in my personal law practice or at
(10) the invitation and with air fare basically paid by the
(11) inviting organization or somebody else.
(12) There were some perhaps, just thinking, for
(13) example, of the one trip I took to London at the invitation
(14) of the Institute of United States Studies at the University
(15) of London to participate in a conference in early 1995 on
(16) the 50th anniversary of the United Nations, and I gave a
(17) paper - I gave two papers, actually.
(18) And I stayed on in London for some number of days
(19) before the conference or after the conference where I met
(20) with members of Parliament, people who were in British
(21) think-tanks, some members of the media and what-not as part
(22) of what I thought would be an effort to get to know and
(23) establish contact with think-tanks overseas.
(24) And so the extra nights that I spent in London on
(25) NPF business I would have billed to NPF, but they were not

Page 72

(1) fund-raising efforts. They were networking.
(2) And also, because my background has been in
(3) foreign policy and I discussed this with Haley at the
(4) beginning, I thought this was an opportunity to talk with
(5) other people about various foreign policy matters on the one
(6) trip I had with several of my former colleagues and
(7) counterparts in the Foreign Commonwealth Office in the
(8) British government and things like that.
(9) So there were, as part of these various trips, I
(10) did things that were related to NPF, and NPF paid what I
(11) hoped was a fair and reasonable allocation of the cost of
(12) that part of the travel.
(13) Q: When was the London trip? Do you recall?
(14) A: It was in the February-March-April, somewhere in
(15) there, in 1995.
(16) Q: What other trips did you take that had an NPF
(17) component to them?
(18) A: I went to Asia in the fall of 1995, principally to
(19) attend a conference in Shanghai sponsored by the Shanghai
(20) Institute of International Studies. That trip was paid for
(21) by the U.N. Association of the United States through a grant
(22) that was made, I believe, by the Asia Foundation.
(23) And the way that worked out with the cost of the
(24) air ticket over and back, within the cost of what it would
(25) have cost me to fly from Washington to Shanghai, I was able

Page 73

(1) to add stops in Hong Kong and Taipei, as well, without any
(2) additional cost to the U.N. Association. I did that and I
(3) spent a couple of days in Hong Kong, a couple of days in
(4) Taipei.
(5) In Hong Kong I met with officials of the British
(6) government that my colleagues here in Washington and in
(7) London in the UKFCO had set up. I met with people from the
(8) Far Eastern Economic Review and the Asia Wall Street
(9) Journal, friends of mine who I had known before.
(10) As the schedule would have it, I was in Hong Kong
(11) over the weekend and I did some sightseeing. I met with
(12) some people in connection with my law practice.
(13) Then I went on to Taipei, where I had meetings
(14) with representatives of the Republic of China government -
(15) Mou Shih-Ding, whom I'd known, who was ambassador here in
(16) Washington, who is now the national security adviser to
(17) President Lee Teng-Hui. I met with a number of people in
(18) the ROC foreign ministry. I met with J.C. Chen, who, at
(19) that time, was the Kuomintang's head of international
(20) relations. I met with Shaw Yu-Ming at the Institute of
(21) International Relations in Taipei. And these were people
(22) that I had either known or dealt with or, in some cases, was
(23) meeting for the first time on basically foreign policy
(24) issues.
(25) In neither Hong Kong nor Taipei nor Shanghai, for

Page 74

[1] that matter, did I do any fund-raising for NPF at all. I
[2] guess that's it.
[3] Q: Prior to your going on these trips, was there any
[4] discussion that you might do fund-raising for NPF with
[5] anyone at NPF?
[6] A: On the trips?
[7] Q: Mm-hmm.
[8] A: I don't think so, no. The Institute of U.S.
[9] Studies trip was at the invitation of the director, Gary
[10] McDowell, whom I'd known at the Department of Justice, and
[11] he invited me because of my tenure in the Bush
[12] Administration as assistant secretary for international
[13] organizations.
[14] Likewise, the trip to Shanghai. I had been
[15] interested in Hong Kong since I was at AID in 1981-1982 when
[16] the first discussions between the UK and the PRC for the
[17] eventual hand-over took place and because at AID, one of the
[18] things we were trying to do was replace the Carter
[19] Administration's policy of basic human needs international
[20] development with a more market-oriented approach and Hong
[21] Kong, I thought back in 1981-'82, was a prime example of
[22] market-oriented international development. I've always been
[23] fascinated by it.
[24] And Taipei, I had, again coming from my experience
[25] in the Bush Administration, I had testified and written on

Page 75

[1] the subject of why the ROC is entitled to representation in
[2] the United Nations separate from the PRC, and that was the
[3] main subject of conversation with people there.
[4] MR. PERRY: That was back in the fall of 1995?
[5] THE WITNESS: The fall of 1995. I want to say
[6] October-November, something like that.
[7] BY MS. ROSENBERG:
[8] Q: Were there any other foreign trips that had any
[9] sort of NPF component, besides the London trip and the Asia
[10] trip?
[11] A: Sometime in probably the early fall of 1995 I was
[12] invited by the Cairo Egyptian-American Chamber of Commerce
[13] to give a speech out there, which I did. I also had private
[14] clients with interests in Cairo that I dealt with on that
[15] trip but that was not really an NPF trip. I was invited
[16] because I was and introduced as the president of NPF.
[17] MS. ROSENBERG: Just for the record, David McKean
[18] from the minority staff has just stepped in.
[19] BY MS. ROSENBERG:
[20] Q: Any other trips?
[21] A: I took some other trips for my law practice.
[22] Q: And on any of these trips did you do any fund-
[23] raising at all for NPF?
[24] A: I didn't do any fund-raising for NPF overseas on
[25] any of my trips.

Page 76

[1] MS. ROSENBERG: Off the record.
[2] [Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the deposition was
[3] adjourned.]

\$	5			B
\$25,000 68:9 \$3 63:10 \$50,000 44:9; 68:6	501(c)(4 18:22; 19:18, 19; 20:11, 22 50th 71:16 535 51:4	9:13; 41:23; 74:12, 25 Administration's 74:19 administrator 6:22 advance 42:10 adviser 36:9; 39:22; 73:16 advising 54:25 AEI 7:15 Affairs 4:5, 8; 7:4; 9:10; 27:25 affiliated 7:18; 69:18 affiliations 59:16 again 4:23; 10:15; 50:9; 74:24 agencies 8:12; 42:6 Agency 6:20 Agenda 27:6; 30:16; 45:5; 60:8 ago 26:20; 68:15, 19 agreed 16:6; 19:1; 24:17; 22; 25:10; 29:18; 56:4 agreeing 4:12 ahead 20:20 AID 6:22; 8:23, 25; 74:15, 17 air 71:10; 72:24 airing 34:19 airport 62:17 allocation 18:9; 72:11 almost 63:5; 64:14; 65:17 alone 71:2 along 21:1; 61:21 already 27:17, 21; 28:3; 46:20; 47:4, 12 alterations 25:12 Although 7:23; 63:21 always 42:11; 74:22 ambassador 73:15 America 12:12; 15:5; 27:6; 30:16; 32:3, 12; 45:5; 51:9, 11; 60:9 American 6:2; 14:1; 33:21, 23; 70:12 among 34:5; 36:25; 42:25 amount 19:9; 67:20 analogy 33:21, 23 analysis 16:19 analysts 34:12 anniversary 71:16 announced 11:2; 27:21, 22 announcement 11:25 answered 29:22 anybody 32:19; 38:22; 53:9; 61:16; 70:20, 22 anyone 12:17; 15:1, 21; 17:15; 26:10; 29:23; 30:2; 31:17, 20, 25; 32:12; 50:13; 52:21; 64:21; 66:11; 74:5 anyway 67:23 anywhere 53:16 appealing 37:6	application 19:20, 21, 24; 20:1, 5, 10, 16, 24 applications 41:24; 42:3 applied 18:22 appointed 9:15 appointment 62:9 appreciate 38:9 approach 15:15; 74:20 approached 15:13, 21; 38:18; 47:5; 65:5 approval 41:25 Approximately 17:18 April 28:15 area 9:1; 18:23 areas 41:2 arena 45:3 argument 34:13 around 11:1; 17:14; 27:18; 28:10, 15, 22; 37:9; 39:4; 41:7; 49:18; 50:5, 7; 62:16 arranged 54:5 arrangement 56:2 array 17:23 arrive 61:8 arrived 27:22 article 13:10; 27:1; 29:5; 49:12 articles 20:7; 48:21; 49:3, 6, 8 articulate 40:25; 41:10 Asia 72:18, 22; 73:8; 75:9 aside 70:2 aspects 48:14 assemble 27:15 assistant 6:21; 7:3, 5, 8; 9:9; 31:13, 14, 14; 74:12 assistants 32:10 associate 6:15 association 60:18, 22; 72:21; 73:2 associations 41:16; 45:17; 64:7; 65:11 assuming 33:14 AT&T 38:2 attachment 5:18 attend 72:19 attended 46:8; 53:4; 69:19 attorney 7:3, 5 attorneys 20:24 attracted 16:12 August 10:1 auspices 67:12 author 33:22 Avenue 46:7 average 30:21; 44:8 avoid 57:23 aware 30:17; 52:21; 56:15, 16; 65:22, 24; 66:11, 14, 15, 17, 19; 69:25	back 22:8; 43:4; 48:14; 51:19; 52:10; 57:24; 61:10; 64:21; 72:24; 74:21; 75:4 background 5:15; 6:5; 18:14; 40:10; 72:2 backwards 7:18 Bank 22:13, 15, 21, 24; 23:5 banking 67:14, 15 Barbara 31:6, 10, 14 Barbour 11:5, 6, 8, 16; 15:9, 13, 15, 24; 16:3, 14, 22; 17:10; 19:8; 22:9; 23:3, 11, 23; 24:8; 26:13, 18; 30:19; 31:4; 32:10; 47:14; 61:23; 62:10 Barbour's 19:23; 24:3; 29:7; 32:10 Baroody 13:8, 12, 22; 14:3, 4, 7, 25 Baroody's 14:3 based 25:7 basic 74:19 basically 10:19; 27:4; 28:13, 14; 30:22; 32:6; 37:22; 48:23; 49:23; 50:8, 12; 53:9; 54:17; 55:14; 60:19; 63:11; 71:10; 73:23 basis 30:15, 18; 31:18, 19; 38:21; 51:23; 54:17, 25; 61:4; 63:13, 21 became 6:14, 19, 21, 24; 7:5, 12; 11:10; 12:11; 14:9; 27:6 become 16:14 becoming 13:4; 15:13, 16, 22; 16:4, 11; 22:9 began 27:14; 29:5 begin 27:5 beginning 28:13; 36:18; 60:15; 63:16; 72:4 believe 14:17; 17:11; 22:5; 23:25; 24:4; 25:22; 33:3, 8; 37:21, 24; 39:23; 45:24; 48:7; 52:11, 16; 53:23; 54:23; 55:3, 12; 56:13, 22; 58:10; 62:20; 66:9; 68:9; 71:8; 72:22 believed 20:9; 66:16 Bell 38:1 below 28:16, 19; 29:25 besides 48:11; 75:9 best 32:21; 38:8, 22; 55:1 better 11:12 big 43:17 Bill 14:2 billed 71:8, 25 bit 16:5; 18:23; 20:21; 28:5; 35:15; 45:6, 20; 57:25 bits 53:24
1 1 5:16, 21; 7:15; 28:16 1,500 49:18 10 21:11; 67:20; 69:1 10-minute 40:12 100 31:23 11 21:11 1150 6:2 14 12:15 15 12:15; 44:4 15,000 50:3 17th 6:2 18,000 50:3 18-month 14:19 19 7:9 1970 6:6 1970s 13:23; 16:17 1974 6:7 1976 11:7 1980s 36:13 1981 6:16, 19 1981-'82 74:21 1981-1982 74:15 1982 6:21 1983 6:23; 10:1 1984 6:25 1985 7:2 1988 7:5 1989 7:7 1993 7:9; 11:1; 12:5, 10; 63:14 1994 12:12; 13:11; 15:17; 22:24; 26:11, 17; 28:13; 51:11; 63:14 1995 7:13; 17:21; 20:25; 21:10; 27:3; 28:16; 32:2; 45:14; 60:15; 63:1, 9, 13, 14; 71:15; 72:15, 18; 75:4, 5, 11 1995-1996 34:3 1996 7:13; 17:22; 43:10; 58:17; 60:15; 63:12	7 70s 14:2	8 84 9:22	9 92 16:15, 15 93 11:5; 13:20, 20; 14:16, 16; 16:15; 27:21 94 14:18; 15:19; 24:6, 7; 27:21 95 21:5; 22:3; 26:23; 27:9; 29:6; 33:9; 34:25; 42:24; 43:7, 8; 45:25; 54:3 95-'96 29:4 96 21:5; 42:24	A abandon 46:13 abide 65:7 able 24:16; 25:1; 31:4; 52:8; 58:23; 61:22; 72:25 absolutely 20:17 academic 37:9; 50:6 academics 41:17 accept 24:1, 3; 26:16; 64:22 accepted 24:13; 26:11, 19; 66:12; 68:3, 4 accepting 24:9, 22 access 55:25 acting 6:18 activities 21:10; 27:7 actual 63:8 actually 10:7; 27:1; 37:1; 43:14; 48:4; 55:17; 66:13; 67:21; 71:17 ad 51:23 add 73:1 addition 25:6; 69:6 additional 27:13; 63:7; 64:5; 73:2 address 5:25 adjudication 8:22 adjunct 14:1 adjusted 25:7 adjustments 25:13 Administration 6:17;
2 20 28:18 25 28:18; 46:9				
3 35 44:8				

Blalock 31:13
Blank 22:3
ks 55:5, 8
board 18:20; 21:19;
29:22; 32:24; 33:2, 4, 6,
10, 11, 14; 55:14, 16
Bob 13:25
Boehner 33:3, 5
Boehner's 33:9
BOLTON 4:3, 10; 5:17,
20, 24; 6:1; 7:11, 19, 23;
40:16
Bolton's 5:7, 15
book 27:5
Bork 13:25
both 18:24; 19:24; 20:2,
25; 33:8; 45:20; 58:20;
60:14; 67:14
branch 8:12
break 40:13, 17
brief 16:9; 21:2
briefly 6:4, 17; 7:10;
18:10; 21:1
bring 32:24; 33:1; 52:8
British 71:20; 72:8; 73:5
broad 17:22; 57:6
broadcast 53:14, 16, 20,
25; 54:2, 5, 12, 14; 55:25;
56:11, 11, 19, 25
adcasts 56:6; 57:14
broadly 6:13; 41:9
broke 63:9, 11
Brooks 37:14; 39:15
Brothers 23:6, 8; 65:21;
70:1
brought 27:13; 58:14
budget 18:2; 50:14;
43:19; 44:4
bulk 18:10; 23:11; 65:7, 9
Burling 6:15, 24; 7:2;
8:18
Bush 9:13; 74:11, 25
business 5:25; 25:16;
32:1, 13; 59:15, 20, 22;
60:22; 71:25

C

C-Span 53:17
cab 52:12; 61:8, 9
cable 56:3
Cairo 75:12, 14
calculus 42:18
calibrate 43:16
call 26:19; 28:19; 29:2;
30:23, 24; 31:10, 11;
17; 63:8; 65:21
called 4:4; 7:23; 11:11;
17:3; 27:3; 28:7; 32:3;
43:17; 65:25; 66:18
calls 54:23; 61:24, 25;
62:15
came 11:15; 13:1; 15:8;

16:24; 24:19; 26:23; 27:9;
17, 18; 28:22; 33:8; 37:20;
40:20; 48:21; 49:8; 52:11;
53:18; 55:14, 16; 58:10;
59:17; 64:24; 65:2; 66:7;
67:5, 11, 12; 69:11
can 16:2; 19:2; 20:18, 19;
38:23; 40:21; 45:25;
55:10, 23; 61:4; 64:1, 8
candidate 17:7
capacity 7:4; 71:4
Capitol 43:14; 46:5; 52:8
car 52:8
care 21:14
career 39:3
carried 48:23
Carter 74:18
Cary 28:4; 48:17
case 39:17; 63:12; 64:1
cases 20:25; 46:19, 21,
21; 65:3; 73:22
cast 41:8
categories 49:21, 23
center 50:20
CEO 38:2
CEOs 37:17, 23; 38:11,
12; 40:1, 4, 7, 8, 11
certain 35:22; 43:21
certainly 16:19; 40:8;
42:9; 53:7; 61:13; 65:7;
70:23, 25
chains 19:11
chaired 12:8
chairman 10:19; 11:10;
16:14; 18:20; 29:22;
37:13, 14; 65:6
Chamber 75:12
changed 49:22, 22
changes 27:10, 11, 15;
28:14
channels 55:25
charge 7:5; 9:19; 10:17;
27:20, 24; 32:7; 35:6;
48:17; 50:13
check 56:22; 65:4; 68:23;
69:5
checks 65:13; 69:11
Chen 73:18
chief 31:15
China 73:14
choose 55:4
chosen 4:24
Christmas 24:4, 6
circles 34:23
Civil 7:6
clarification 47:24
clarify 31:25; 48:6; 68:10
clear 18:18; 19:13; 24:15;
32:17
clerical 15:5
client 8:20; 25:23
clients 8:13; 9:2; 75:14
closed 37:22

closely 30:18
closing 36:9
Club 46:5
co-chairs 12:9
Coast 69:14, 20
colleagues 72:6; 73:6
College 6:6
comfortable 59:9
coming 57:9; 65:13;
74:24
command 19:12
comments 42:4
Commerce 75:12
commercial 32:4; 54:15,
25
commission 68:22, 24;
69:6, 8, 10, 16
commissioners 42:2
commitment 25:4
committed 54:5
Committee 4:4, 8; 7:1;
9:22; 10:4, 6, 16, 18, 20;
25:25; 39:10; 53:5
committees 37:8; 51:21
Common 13:11; 21:16;
27:1, 2, 7; 28:2; 29:5; 45:4;
48:18; 49:4, 16; 50:2, 10,
13, 15, 23, 25; 51:17; 60:8
Commonwealth 72:7
community 41:7
companies 9:3; 42:3;
45:9, 16; 46:20, 21; 47:4;
65:20
Company 37:25; 63:8;
68:2
comparable 63:19
compensation 9:25;
10:2, 3; 17:24
competent 59:8
competition 42:25
compiled 50:4
completely 29:9; 70:19
complex 42:18
component 72:17; 75:9
concepts 42:24
concern 42:11
concerned 20:15; 42:1, 5
concerning 37:1
concerted 70:19
concluded 33:8; 50:21;
54:3
concurred 29:12; 59:11
conduct 27:5
conducted 21:12
conference 35:7; 36:6,
21; 38:19, 22; 39:1, 17;
41:23; 44:18; 53:12;
71:15, 19, 19; 72:19
conferences 29:10, 14;
30:15; 42:20; 53:7
confidence 22:14
confident 20:2
confirmed 7:3, 8

confirming 5:17; 38:14
conflict 24:18
Congress 8:10; 36:25;
37:16; 41:5; 43:8; 50:4;
51:4; 52:4, 19, 22
congressional 15:17;
42:11; 51:25
Congressman 33:3, 5, 9;
39:15
connection 13:10; 15:3;
38:5; 42:13; 68:11, 13;
69:5; 73:12
conservative 34:17
consider 27:16
considered 34:17; 37:6;
51:24; 63:13
constituency 37:7
constructed 41:18
consultant 9:25; 66:23
consulting 67:9
contact 8:12; 14:6; 15:24;
39:8; 60:23; 71:23
contacted 5:2, 4, 11
contacts 38:24; 53:11;
64:10
contained 27:1; 37:19
contains 64:5
contemplating 47:7
contexts 39:13
continue 23:19; 24:16;
27:6; 56:6
continued 7:18; 25:8
contract 8:14, 23
contribute 12:21, 25;
34:21; 49:3
contributed 34:21; 47:4
contribution 44:18, 22;
46:20; 49:12; 60:24;
63:25; 64:23; 65:24;
66:12, 14, 20; 67:5, 5, 11;
68:5, 8, 13; 70:7
contributions 23:15;
44:14; 54:9; 56:18; 62:23;
65:15, 18, 22; 66:17;
67:20; 68:25; 69:23, 25;
70:5, 6, 24; 71:1
contributor 49:19
contributors 18:16;
49:19, 25; 50:11; 59:24;
60:7, 12; 65:7, 9
conundrum 36:17
convention 10:9
conversation 13:17;
16:3, 9, 10, 21; 17:1, 9;
19:3; 20:25; 23:3, 10;
24:11; 49:7; 75:3
conversations 14:13,
14, 20; 15:6; 20:23; 24:13,
24; 26:21; 32:15; 47:17
convince 59:7
convinced 67:19; 70:4
coordination 6:22
Copeland 66:13
copies 21:16, 17; 37:22;
50:13; 51:5

corporate 37:2, 17;
38:16; 41:14, 20, 22;
49:19; 70:9, 23
corporation 60:17; 66:3,
5
corporations 64:6;
65:10, 16, 23; 70:25
correcting 47:25
correctly 51:9
cost 43:25, 25; 44:1;
50:19; 56:16, 17; 72:11,
23, 24, 25; 73:2
cost-effective 54:4
couldn't 19:8; 70:11
Council 12:1, 2, 4, 6, 9,
14, 15, 18; 13:5, 14; 40:24;
41:3; 50:10
councils 11:25; 12:16;
49:18; 50:11; 51:6; 52:2;
57:13; 59:15
counsel 4:4, 7, 13, 15,
21, 24; 5:2, 4, 12; 6:18, 19;
20:2, 2, 4, 5; 21:22, 23;
22:1, 2; 54:24
count 33:2
counterparts 72:7
country 28:24; 36:14;
50:6, 7; 62:16
couple 7:17; 12:7, 10;
14:22; 17:2; 26:21; 31:12;
45:13; 53:18; 57:14, 19;
62:4; 70:19; 73:3, 3
course 31:22, 24
Court 36:15
covering 59:19
Covington 6:15, 24; 7:2;
8:18
craft 35:17
Crawford 27:24
created 12:1; 28:6
creativity 16:16
credit 35:14
criticizing 42:1
Cultural 65:25; 66:6;
68:7; 69:24
Cummings 48:2
current 5:24; 53:12
currently 29:10
cut 67:19

D

D.C 6:3
da-da 64:3
da-da-da 64:4
daily 59:21
date 17:12; 63:11
David 75:17
day 19:7; 48:17, 17;
61:10; 70:3
days 19:5; 36:12; 71:18;
73:3, 3
deal 21:6; 60:21

dealing 32:11, 11
dealings 20:21
dealt 39:12; 73:22; 75:14
debate 34:5, 8, 14, 16, 18;
35:5, 12; 43:11
debt 18:6; 22:11, 12, 23,
25; 23:1, 2; 63:4, 5, 6, 13,
14, 15, 18, 19, 22
debts 23:1
December 7:2, 13; 16:8;
26:11, 17; 64:19
decide 26:2; 48:21; 49:5
decided 22:24; 26:16;
46:9; 49:14
deciding 49:2, 14
decision 38:16; 46:10;
55:15, 17, 19
decision-maker 60:23
decision-making 40:22
decisions 30:5, 6, 13;
35:8; 37:4
decisions-makers 37:3
decrease 28:10; 63:5, 19
decreased 34:15
decreasing 28:12
define 42:20; 55:23
degree 6:11
delegates 10:8
Democrat 50:5
Democratic 52:18; 53:5
Democrats 53:8
Denning 28:6; 30:3;
55:17
Denning's 28:6
Department 36:12;
39:11, 13, 14; 58:7; 74:10
deposition 4:13; 5:3, 5,
7, 12, 20; 38:5
deregulate 34:16; 35:13
deregulation 34:14;
37:2; 42:24
describe 6:4, 12; 16:2;
28:25; 40:21; 46:24; 66:2
described 29:3, 4; 35:5,
12; 45:12; 48:12; 49:21;
60:7; 62:1
describes 33:25; 62:18
descriptions 62:12
design 63:23
detail 22:20; 27:1; 47:20
determined 43:13, 20;
51:20; 59:13
develop 16:13
developing 33:18
Development 6:20;
65:21; 74:20, 22
Diane 27:23; 47:10;
58:14, 19; 59:21; 60:16,
20; 61:16; 62:8, 8, 14, 19;
67:25; 70:21
different 8:7; 31:23;
34:11, 11, 11, 12; 35:16,
16, 17; 42:13; 45:16, 17;
49:10; 53:19, 19; 57:13,

22; 59:14
difficult 41:14; 42:7
direct 23:16; 65:12
direction 32:18
directly 21:6; 31:5
director 6:25; 9:22; 10:8,
15; 74:9
directors 21:20; 40:24;
41:3; 51:5
discuss 11:8, 16; 12:11;
17:24; 18:2, 5; 25:3; 26:9;
35:10; 39:17; 47:19
discussed 11:11, 11;
17:19; 18:3, 8, 17, 21, 24;
19:21, 23; 24:12; 29:13,
16; 30:14, 15, 16; 50:19;
70:24; 72:3
discussing 56:9; 69:24
discussion 13:14; 18:4;
22:8, 9; 23:7; 33:20; 35:21;
36:25; 37:5, 10; 42:22;
43:6; 74:4
discussions 57:6; 70:21;
74:16
dispute 8:21
disputes 8:14, 23
distinct 61:14
distribution 42:25
District 36:15
Division 7:6
document 12:11; 21:9;
64:7
documentation 21:15,
18
documented 63:25;
64:12
documents 20:8; 38:4, 6;
55:16
Dole 14:4; 36:11, 15;
39:19
dollar 63:20, 20
domestic 9:6, 7; 67:15
dominant 34:1, 1
Donald 15:11
done 8:17; 25:10; 47:6, 9;
52:25; 53:22; 57:3, 8; 58:4;
60:2
donors 49:11; 59:12, 13;
64:22
door 65:13
down 36:3; 37:22; 42:16;
46:6; 55:5, 8; 65:5
Dr 64:3
draft 10:18
drafts 12:11
Drug 41:23, 24
duly 4:5
during 6:24; 7:14, 19;
8:15; 14:19; 16:10; 23:3,
10, 23; 24:16, 24; 31:22,
24; 32:2; 44:4; 65:22; 70:4
duties 9:17; 10:16

E

e-l 48:7, 8
each 35:15, 16; 38:14, 19,
19; 41:18, 18; 46:18; 56:17
eager 23:17
earlier 23:20; 53:21;
54:10; 60:2
early 6:16; 13:23; 14:2;
16:8; 21:5; 42:24; 43:5, 11;
71:15; 75:11
easily 70:11
Eastern 73:8
Economic 73:8
editor 48:18
editorial 49:9
editorship 28:2
educational 6:4, 8, 10
effect 23:1; 27:12; 32:4;
68:22
effective 46:11, 14
effort 42:12, 19; 45:7;
70:14, 20; 71:22
efforts 72:1
Egyptian-American
75:12
Ehrenrich 31:14
either 5:12; 27:21; 38:14,
25; 42:21; 47:6; 49:15;
53:6; 58:21, 22; 59:9;
60:22; 67:22; 70:11; 71:9;
73:22
El 58:13, 15; 68:17
elected 33:2; 52:4; 57:12
election 15:17; 16:15;
33:8, 9
electrical 43:1
eliminate 63:6
eliminated 28:6
else 15:1; 17:15; 26:10;
29:23; 30:2; 31:17, 20;
32:1, 13, 22; 35:20; 38:12;
40:21, 22; 56:16, 25;
61:17; 69:1, 10; 70:22;
71:11
employed 14:24
employment 5:8; 6:12;
10:24; 26:9, 10
enacted 43:8
encourage 33:19; 34:5
encouraging 34:8
end 7:13; 60:15; 63:15, 23
ended 54:4
engage 27:7
enjoy 46:12
enough 59:9; 65:2
entail 16:6, 11
Enterprise 6:2; 14:1
Enterprises 67:11, 13,
17, 23; 68:11; 70:3
entertainment 68:1
entire 39:3

entirely 57:24; 58:18
entities 67:16
entitled 75:1
entity 65:24; 66:15, 16
environment 57:3, 4, 15
EPA 42:5; 57:20
equal 63:3, 5
equally 21:2
essentially 18:12; 21:1;
23:21; 34:12
establish 54:18; 71:23
established 36:22
Estates 66:18
estimate 61:5
estimated 19:9
even 42:15; 56:2; 61:18;
63:9, 11
event 69:14, 19
events 43:17; 44:24;
45:11; 48:11
eventual 74:17
eventually 27:6; 60:4;
67:19
eventuate 13:15
every 51:3; 64:1
everybody 32:16; 37:20
exactly 16:20; 63:5
examination 4:4, 7
examined 4:6
example 8:23, 24; 31:10;
34:8; 41:22; 42:23; 43:12;
60:17; 71:13; 74:21
examples 45:2
exchange 49:12; 55:11;
70:12
exciting 16:20
exclude 62:4
excluding 70:1
Excuse 25:22
executive 6:25; 8:12;
9:21; 10:8, 15; 37:25; 38:1
Exhibit 5:16, 20
existed 56:2
existence 10:25
Existing 17:22
expected 18:8
expenditures 63:2, 9
expenses 18:9; 52:6;
63:3; 71:2, 7
experience 6:8; 18:12;
19:11; 20:12; 23:21; 59:5;
60:4; 74:24
experiences 6:10
experts 41:4
explain 60:19
explained 19:24; 22:25;
23:15
explaining 18:15
explanatory 64:5
expressed 22:13
extensively 20:2
extent 34:13; 35:23;

39:14
extra 71:24
extraordinarily 20:14

F

facility 54:14
fact 18:21; 19:21; 25:7
fair 35:25; 72:11
fairly 16:9; 36:2; 46:23
faithful 59:21
fall 12:5, 10; 13:20; 14:16;
72:18; 75:4, 5, 11
familiar 40:24; 65:10
family-owned 70:13
far 23:13; 25:20; 33:17;
73:8
fare 52:12; 71:10
fascinated 74:23
fashion 6:13
father 14:3
FDA 42:2
feared 41:15, 20
February 6:19, 21; 34:25
February-March-April
72:14
Federal 8:21; 19:10;
36:15
fee 54:15, 18, 25; 55:1;
67:10, 18, 21; 69:9
feel 27:4; 56:1
felt 43:8
ferment 16:16; 34:22
few 39:5; 65:11; 68:19
Fierce 15:11, 12
figure 22:16, 17
figures 18:4
file 37:20
files 33:16; 47:3; 57:2;
64:12, 18, 18, 19
filing 20:1
filled 28:3; 42:10
final 21:23; 35:7; 55:15
finally 69:1
finance 58:7; 64:18
financial 18:5; 26:7;
30:12
find 38:22; 67:25
finding 11:12
fired 32:22
firm 7:11; 22:3, 3, 5;
25:13, 20; 67:14, 14, 15,
15
first 4:5; 6:17; 10:25;
11:23, 24; 13:23; 15:13,
15, 21, 24; 16:2, 21; 22:2,
9, 21; 23:3, 10, 23; 24:5;
26:23; 27:2, 9; 31:12; 32:2;
34:9; 35:1, 2, 24; 36:1, 16,
20; 39:19, 24; 40:8; 43:21;
54:3; 58:1, 3; 63:14; 67:11;
73:23; 74:16
fit 49:9

five 58:2, 61:7
fixed 25:9; 43:22
fly 72:25
 ow 36:23; 47:19;
61:22; 62:14; 64:2, 14
follow-up 60:21
followed 36:11
follows 4:6
Food 41:23
footage 53:22
for-profit 66:5
foray 58:3
Forbes 59:22
Foreign 12:1, 15, 18;
39:10; 57:4; 65:16, 20, 23;
66:2; 68:11; 69:25; 70:4, 5,
15, 20; 71:1, 3, 5, 8; 72:3,
5, 7; 73:18, 23; 75:8
foreign-owned 65:16
forget 33:22
form 12:20
formal 6:10; 38:15
formation 11:2, 8, 17, 18,
19, 21
formed 29:9
former 72:6
formula 41:18
forth 57:24
Fortune 59:22
Forum 7:12; 11:9, 14, 17,
22; 12:17, 22, 24; 13:2,
3, 7, 15, 17; 14:10, 13, 21,
25; 15:1; 7:8; 27:3; 34:24;
53:1; 58:7, 8; 59:17
forums 28:24; 40:20
found 41:12, 13; 69:1
Foundation 65:25; 68:8;
69:24; 72:22
Foundation's 66:7
founding 19:25
four 61:7
fraction 61:3
frame 13:18; 19:2
Fran 28:1; 32:6; 48:24;
54:20
frankly 25:17
free 27:4; 50:23
frequently 41:12, 13;
57:7, 10
friendly 14:6
friends 20:13; 73:9
Fry 22:4, 5
fulfill 56:5
fulfilled 25:5
fully 19:1
functions 14:22; 20:18
fund 60:25; 61:19; 75:22
 d-raiser 23:19; 47:25;
66:21
fund-raisers 46:14; 59:1
fund-raising 16:22, 24;
18:11, 12; 23:12, 13, 16,
21; 27:21; 44:24; 45:11;

48:11; 58:6; 60:3, 4, 5;
61:5, 15, 23; 62:6, 11, 21;
64:9; 65:8; 72:1; 74:1, 4;
75:24
fundamentally 34:17
funds 44:12; 67:6
further 49:25; 56:6

G

Gary 74:9
gave 71:16, 17
Gaylord 66:21, 22; 67:9,
18; 68:1, 21, 25; 69:7, 8,
15, 18
Gee 56:21
general 6:19; 7:3, 5;
12:19; 13:17; 18:3; 44:11,
12; 54:9; 59:19
generalized 12:25
generally 36:10
Gerald 37:24
Gingrich 45:20; 67:2;
69:19
given 37:20; 42:11; 49:11
goings-on 59:20
Good 4:10, 11; 29:18;
33:23; 43:24; 48:20; 57:20
GOP-TV 53:14
Government 8:21;
19:11; 72:8; 73:6, 14
Governmental 4:5, 8
governor 57:15, 17
Grace 27:23; 47:9; 48:1,
2, 5; 58:11, 14, 18; 62:2, 3;
70:22
graduated 6:6, 14
grant 72:21
granted 19:24; 20:6, 17
granting 20:11
grassroots 28:24
great 29:19; 36:20
greater 63:15, 17
groups 50:22
guarantee 23:5, 9
Guesnier 27:20; 58:12,
13
guess 33:2; 42:23; 46:9;
61:13; 74:2
guest 47:2
guests 38:10; 46:16;
52:23; 57:11, 12, 22
guidance 32:18

H

Haj 58:13, 15
Haley 11:5, 6, 8, 16; 15:9;
22:9; 23:3, 11, 23; 26:13,
18, 25; 29:3, 7, 22; 30:7, 8,
14, 19; 31:4, 9; 32:10, 10;
33:7; 35:22; 45:19; 47:14;
54:5; 55:6, 7; 56:4; 58:1,

20, 22; 59:8, 25; 61:23;
62:10; 64:11; 67:19; 72:3
Haley's 46:10
half 17:18; 54:2; 61:9
hall 43:22
hand-outs 37:19
hand-over 74:17
handled 68:24
handling 20:24
happen 43:10; 61:11
happened 56:23
happening 43:14
happy 43:3
harassed 57:20
hard 30:21; 43:16; 61:2
harder 42:8
Harrison 27:23; 47:10;
58:14, 19; 59:21; 60:16;
61:16; 62:8, 14, 19; 67:25;
70:22
haven't 5:11; 38:4
head 37:24; 56:1, 9;
73:19
headed 14:2
headquarters 46:7
health 21:13
heard 67:24; 68:12, 14,
16, 17; 70:7
hearings 43:15
Heather 58:13, 15
hello 31:23
help 16:13; 51:21
helpful 13:13
helping 16:18
here's 56:22; 64:4
high 6:5; 37:10; 42:9;
55:6, 9
high-level 36:24
highest 63:10
highlight 35:17
Hill 8:20; 43:14; 46:5; 52:8
himself 19:14
hire 58:22
hired 58:24
hiring 58:18
history 6:12
hoc 51:23
Holly 31:13
Hollywood 68:1
honestly 53:20
Hong 73:1, 3, 5, 10, 25;
74:15, 20
honoraria 52:13, 15
hoped 18:14; 34:21;
36:23; 45:9; 62:15; 72:11
host 57:23; 58:1, 1, 5
hotel 42:16; 43:23; 52:9
hour 17:18; 54:2; 61:9
hourly 61:12
House 37:13, 14; 41:4;
67:1
Howard 19:14, 15

Huckaby 57:18
human 74:19

I

idea 11:11, 11, 14, 16;
16:12, 25; 24:25; 29:4, 7,
9, 13, 18, 19; 43:24; 63:18
ideas 17:21; 41:2
identification 5:22
identified 70:11; 71:6
identify 19:14
identity 59:12
illness 22:4
immediately 29:25
importance 18:24
important 16:23; 48:22;
61:20
impression 68:10
improper 25:25
include 48:23
included 21:11
incorporation 20:8
increase 28:10; 63:4, 18
increased 34:15
indication 50:1
individual 11:4; 32:11;
38:19, 20, 20
individually 38:18
individuals 9:4; 31:16;
32:9; 47:1, 22; 50:22;
56:19; 65:11
industrialized 36:14
industries 47:6; 66:18
industry 37:17; 41:24;
46:17, 18; 59:20
inefficient 20:19
information 19:23; 21:5,
8, 19, 21; 26:7
initiated 14:13, 14, 15
input 10:21
inquiries 54:21
inquiry 26:5; 59:16
Institute 6:2; 7:10; 14:1;
71:14; 72:20; 73:20; 74:8
insulting 25:21
integrity 25:25
intellectual 16:16; 34:4,
22
intellectually 34:1
intended 23:18; 36:9;
63:21
interest 24:19; 44:17
interested 16:4, 17;
18:13; 35:25; 37:3, 8;
46:22; 47:8, 13; 59:18;
74:15
interesting 49:7
interests 75:14
internal 52:1
International 6:20; 7:8;
8:6; 9:2, 3, 10, 20; 21:13;
38:1; 72:20; 73:19, 21;

74:12, 19, 22
into 10:21; 28:24; 31:23;
38:16; 58:3; 59:12; 63:13,
14; 64:8
introduced 45:20; 75:16
invariably 64:14
investigation 4:14; 5:19;
25:15
investment 67:14, 15
invitation 38:15; 71:10,
13; 74:9
invitations 47:18
invite 38:11, 12, 21;
47:12, 22
invited 39:17; 40:18, 21;
45:15; 47:15; 52:5; 74:11;
75:12, 15
inviting 40:19; 71:11
involved 8:8; 11:19;
23:17; 35:19, 20, 23;
36:17, 20; 37:1; 40:22;
47:5; 52:1; 54:11; 55:19;
60:4, 10
involvement 13:6; 40:19;
55:10; 69:15
IRS 19:22; 20:13, 18, 21;
21:5, 6; 22:6
issue 27:2; 35:24; 50:3;
51:3; 56:9
issues 21:12, 13; 29:11;
30:12; 33:20; 34:6; 35:9,
18; 40:25; 42:21; 43:10;
52:25; 57:25; 73:24
itself 50:20

J

J.C 73:18
Jack 37:14; 66:13
Jackie 28:9; 30:1; 31:11
Jackson 57:16
January 7:9, 13, 15;
26:23; 27:9, 14; 28:16;
29:6; 33:9
Jay 36:8; 39:21
Jessica 68:17
job 16:23; 23:22, 24;
25:10; 26:6; 48:20; 59:8
Joe 66:21, 22
JOHN 4:3; 6:1
join 4:12; 13:15
joined 6:16; 33:3
Journal 59:22; 73:9
judge 36:15
judgment 59:6
judgments 49:8
Judy 13:9; 14:25; 28:3
July 6:23; 9:25
jumping 20:20
jurisdiction 37:15
Justice 36:12; 39:13;
74:10

K

K 61:8
Kassebaum 12:9
keep 47:25; 61:12
keeping 18:24
Kelly 27:20; 58:12, 13
Kentucky 62:20
kept 64:18
key 36:25
Keyworth 36:8; 39:21
kind 8:4; 12:7; 37:5; 41:6;
10; 46:23; 52:2; 57:5;
60:11, 20; 64:13
kinds 41:25; 57:13
Kirk 31:7, 13
knew 14:9; 40:9, 10, 25;
41:6; 43:22, 23; 47:12;
58:21, 21; 59:20; 69:22
knowing 20:17; 59:9
knowledge 11:24; 32:21;
55:1
knowledgeable 51:24
known 11:6; 32:22; 39:9,
19, 21; 44:5; 67:16; 70:12;
73:9, 15, 22; 74:10
Kong 73:1, 3, 5, 10, 25;
74:15, 21
Kuomintang's 73:19

L

L-a-x-a-l-t 10:11
laid 29:4
large 37:11; 65:13
largely 46:24
last 19:3; 48:1
late 16:17; 21:5; 22:3;
42:23
later 12:11; 28:8; 45:6
laundry 57:19
Law 6:7, 9, 14; 7:11, 14,
18; 8:4, 6; 9:2; 13:24, 25;
18:23; 22:3, 3; 24:16; 25:1,
5, 8, 13, 20; 53:12; 67:14,
15; 71:9; 73:12; 75:21
lawmakers 34:11
lawyer 24:18
lawyers 20:13
Laxalt 10:9, 11
leader 36:19
leaders 37:3
learn 10:25
learned 11:23; 70:18
learning 11:3
least 11:6; 14:6, 23;
21:15; 39:23; 53:4, 24;
63:15
leave 27:18
leaving 27:12, 22; 65:20;
70:2
Lee 73:17

leery 61:6
left 6:23; 7:2, 10; 22:3;
27:25; 28:3; 58:13, 16;
64:19
legal 66:4
legislation 36:16; 43:15
legislative 7:4
legwork 47:8
Lerner 7:11, 19, 23; 8:4,
8, 9, 16
less 63:17
lesser 39:14
letter 5:17; 56:21; 64:2,
15
letters 38:14; 64:9, 16
level 28:15, 20; 36:2;
37:10; 42:9; 63:10, 10
Levin 37:24
libraries 50:6, 7, 18
Lieutenant 57:17
lighting 44:2
Likewise 74:14
Linda 22:2
lines 21:1
Lisa 4:13
list 13:1; 47:2; 49:20, 21,
22; 50:4, 8; 62:15, 17
listed 70:12
Listening 12:11; 15:5;
32:3, 12; 51:9, 11
lists 49:22; 50:2, 7
litigation 8:7
little 16:5; 19:2; 20:20;
28:5; 35:15; 45:6, 20;
57:17, 25
loan 22:21, 23, 24; 23:5, 8
loans 63:7, 21
lobbied 52:21
lobbying 8:8, 9, 10, 15,
17, 18, 19; 9:2; 52:18;
53:12
local 9:6
London 71:13, 15, 18,
24; 72:13; 73:7; 75:9
long 16:25; 17:17; 19:4,
5; 20:11, 14; 22:2; 51:12;
62:3
longer 28:5; 34:15
look 27:4; 42:15
looked 67:16
looking 41:9; 67:23;
70:23
loose 19:11
loosely 52:22
lost 16:16
lot 6:10; 12:23; 19:10;
28:23; 32:14; 33:19; 34:4;
41:6; 47:11; 58:4; 60:3, 3;
66:24, 25; 70:24
lots 19:11
Lott 10:19
loved 50:15
Lugar 12:8

lunch 43:25
luncheon 36:10

M

mail 12:23; 23:16; 65:12
mailed 50:2, 8
mailing 12:20; 13:1
main 75:3
major 29:10, 13; 33:20;
36:13; 37:2; 42:11; 43:9;
59:25
majority 4:16; 36:19;
62:22, 23
making 35:7; 38:17;
49:12; 50:19; 55:20
managed 47:1
management 18:19;
27:15; 37:17
managing 18:17; 48:18
Manhattan 7:10
many 23:16; 28:17;
39:19; 41:24; 42:4; 46:8;
51:4; 52:11
March 7:4; 28:15; 34:25
marked 5:16, 21
market-oriented 74:20,
22
Mary 27:24
material 64:5
materials 21:10
matter 44:17; 74:1
matters 5:7; 8:13, 21, 22;
19:25; 72:5
May 7:7; 37:22; 38:4;
45:25; 46:1; 47:23; 49:20,
22, 22; 51:6; 62:3; 68:21
maybe 39:24
McAllister 31:8, 15
McDowell 74:10
MCI 38:2
McKean 75:17
McMannis 7:24
mean 23:13; 42:15;
47:24; 61:6; 62:4
means 55:22
mechanism 11:12
mechanisms 59:14
media 50:7; 71:21
meet 16:6; 18:16; 61:9;
64:3
meeting 12:8; 17:15, 17,
19, 25; 18:2; 22:21; 23:23;
24:15; 29:16; 33:10;
64:13; 73:23
meetings 12:7, 10; 15:4;
24:8, 10; 26:18, 22; 33:12,
15; 60:13; 61:1, 8, 15;
62:7; 64:10; 65:9; 73:13
megaconference 34:9;
35:2; 39:16, 24; 41:18;
42:23; 47:6, 7; 52:24; 57:9,
9

megaconferences
21:11; 27:5; 28:25; 29:7;
35:16; 36:3, 24; 37:19;
40:5, 7, 9, 17; 43:13, 18,
19; 44:10, 15, 23; 51:19;
52:5, 14, 17, 23; 53:4, 14;
56:24; 57:7; 59:17; 60:8
member 10:7; 12:2;
21:19; 51:4
members 10:8; 32:24;
36:25; 37:7, 16; 41:4, 5;
49:17; 50:4, 9, 10; 51:6,
25; 52:4, 18, 22; 71:20, 21
mention 16:22; 23:8;
32:15; 48:10
mentioned 9:1, 21; 13:6;
22:16, 17, 22; 23:20;
24:14; 31:12; 34:23;
56:24; 69:20
met 13:23; 14:8; 15:12;
17:11; 19:7; 20:3, 9; 39:15,
16; 64:2; 71:19; 73:5, 7,
11, 17, 18, 20
metaphor 34:4; 43:5
mid 36:12
might 13:13, 14, 16; 16:6,
11; 42:2; 44:18; 46:22;
47:13; 52:19, 21; 53:3, 22;
54:21; 57:3; 59:18, 23;
61:7; 67:18; 74:4
Mike 13:8, 12; 14:3, 4, 25
million 63:10
mind 20:14; 26:25; 57:8
mine 13:10; 20:13; 46:10;
73:9
ministry 73:18
MINORITY 4:7, 14; 5:2;
19:16; 61:14; 75:18
minute 26:20
minutes 17:2; 33:11, 14
mission 26:24; 27:3;
44:20
Mississippi 31:3; 57:16,
16
Mm-hmm 74:7
Molly 31:7
money 22:12, 13, 14;
64:25; 65:3; 66:7, 7, 10;
67:10; 70:15, 20; 71:1
month 54:2
monthly 56:5; 67:18;
69:9
months 32:2; 54:3
moon 33:25; 43:5
Mor 67:13
more 19:3; 26:22; 47:20;
51:20; 74:20
morning 4:10, 11
most 23:14; 37:6; 40:25;
43:7; 52:9; 64:6
mostly 45:21; 46:10;
48:20; 50:17; 51:25
Mou 73:15
move 10:24
moving 28:24; 58:6

much 22:15; 24:25; 25:1;
34:7; 35:19; 43:2; 44:4;
46:12; 59:5; 60:25; 61:5;
68:5, 7; 69:3; 70:18
myself 20:8; 30:9; 33:3;
59:5

N

name 5:24; 17:6; 48:1;
55:24; 68:12, 14, 16, 17,
20; 69:17
named 31:16; 32:9, 11;
38:11; 50:22
names 31:12; 59:13, 25;
65:10; 67:16; 70:9
National 7:12; 11:9, 14,
17, 20, 22; 12:17, 21; 13:2,
4, 7, 15, 17; 14:10, 12, 21,
24; 15:1, 7, 8; 27:3; 53:5;
58:6, 8; 59:16; 73:16
nationals 65:16
Nations 13:11; 71:16;
75:2
natural 37:6
nature 34:13; 44:20
necessarily 27:14;
63:20; 64:11
necessary 25:10
needed 30:22
needs 74:19
negotiated 55:13
neither 73:25
net 41:8; 63:15
Network 55:11
networking 72:1
networks 53:18; 56:3
Nevada 10:12
new 28:7; 32:24; 41:24
Newsletter 21:17; 48:24;
49:16, 17, 24; 51:17
newspaper 38:6
newspapers 70:18
next 7:22; 17:9
nights 71:24
Nitiarta 68:18
nitty-gritty 42:16
non-U.S 66:10
noncongressional 39:8
nor 73:25, 25
Norfolk 57:18
normal 44:13; 54:8
Northwest 6:2
not-for-profit 66:16
notary 4:6
notion 29:9, 13
November 15:19; 16:8;
23:24; 75:6
NPF 5:2, 5, 8, 12; 7:20;
8:19; 10:24; 15:9, 22;
16:11, 12; 17:21; 18:6, 15,
17, 21; 19:19, 25; 20:4, 5,
22; 21:7, 11, 17, 19, 23;

22:1, 2, 10, 10, 23; 23:15;
24:17, 17; 25:2, 5, 10, 13;
26:10, 10, 13, 24, 25;
27:10, 19; 28:22, 23;
29:11, 15, 20; 30:5, 12, 20,
25; 32:1, 2, 13, 15, 20, 25;
33:16, 17, 18, 19; 35:22;
36:20; 37:7, 21; 38:7; 39:6;
40:23; 44:10, 19; 45:2, 9,
11, 21, 21; 48:15, 16; 50:1;
52:1, 20; 53:11, 23; 54:1,
16, 18; 55:13; 56:14, 15,
16; 57:2; 60:5, 7, 10, 19;
61:20; 62:11, 17; 63:3, 13;
64:5, 12, 17, 18, 21; 65:15,
23; 66:11; 67:10; 68:23;
69:25; 70:14, 21; 71:4, 4,
6, 8, 25, 25; 72:10, 10, 16;
74:1, 4, 5; 75:9, 15, 16, 23,
24
NPF's 10:25; 18:2, 5;
21:10; 46:6, 23; 47:8, 19;
52:3; 55:10; 71:2
Number 5:16; 11:25;
13:13; 34:10; 37:16, 16;
50:17; 53:18; 54:20; 59:2;
65:14; 71:18; 73:17
numbers 63:24

obligations 56:5
obviously 5:6; 18:19;
24:17; 36:19
occasionally 31:21
occasions 13:9
occurred 19:6
October 75:6
off 22:14, 25; 53:1; 63:5;
67:19
offer 23:24; 24:3, 9, 13;
25:9; 26:16
offhand 59:4
office 6:18; 17:11; 19:8;
29:17; 30:25; 39:16;
60:17; 72:7
officeholders 50:5
officials 41:22; 51:6;
52:4; 57:12; 73:5
often 14:18; 30:19; 60:16
on-going 51:14
once 13:8; 15:7; 54:2
one 12:24; 14:23; 20:23,
23; 24:14; 28:15; 30:11;
33:15; 34:1; 35:1, 24; 36:1,
16; 40:8; 41:12, 13, 17, 18;
42:23; 43:21; 45:25; 46:1,
5, 5, 17; 49:19; 53:5; 57:3,
4, 7, 15, 16, 18, 21; 58:1,
22; 60:13; 62:5; 67:13, 14;
73:72:5; 74:17
one-and-a-half-party
33:24
one-on 60:12
one-page 37:19
one-time 51:13

ones 53:19
only 26:13; 36:13; 56:16
onto 15:8
open 53:7, 9
opening 36:7
operating 63:3, 9; 71:2
operation 50:16; 67:24
operational 20:3
operationally 18:25
operations 62:21
opinion 19:23
opportunity 49:11; 72:4
option 56:6
order 5:18; 37:18; 65:6
orders 32:18
organization 55:12;
66:18; 70:7; 71:11
organizational 9:10;
12:8; 19:25; 20:3
organizationally 18:25
organizations 7:9; 9:3,
8, 12, 20; 74:13
original 12:16
originally 28:7; 36:9
Others 35:22; 38:3; 39:1;
46:2; 47:5, 11; 48:13; 50:7;
61:19; 64:11
otherwise 27:7
ours 54:24
out 22:24; 27:16; 29:4;
36:17; 37:11; 38:13; 43:9;
48:16; 54:8, 9; 61:25; 62:4,
17; 63:8, 12, 22, 24; 64:10;
65:21; 67:25; 72:23; 75:13
outside 25:21; 66:8
over 14:20, 21; 16:5;
27:2; 29:3; 30:24; 31:7;
32:8; 39:2; 50:9, 9; 55:21,
23; 56:1, 9; 58:16; 60:13;
72:24; 73:11
overall 9:19; 10:17;
21:24; 28:10; 35:6; 48:19
overseas 71:23; 75:24
owed 22:12, 13, 15, 18;
63:4
own 27:15; 40:10; 41:19;
51:5; 52:11
owned 57:19
owners 56:15

P

Pacific 65:25; 66:6; 68:7;
69:24
Packwood 37:12; 39:12
paid 9:24; 22:14; 32:4;
54:7, 8, 15; 63:5; 67:9;
71:10; 72:10, 20
pale 34:2
Panda 66:18, 18; 67:10,
13, 17, 23; 68:11; 69:5, 24;
70:2, 6
panelists 36:5; 37:23;

38:11, 25; 40:9, 17, 18, 19,
20, 21; 42:7; 51:22; 52:19,
23
panels 35:8, 10; 36:22;
37:18; 51:20
paper 38:16; 68:19, 20;
71:17
papers 68:15; 71:17
Parliament 71:20
part 5:7; 16:23; 22:25;
44:16; 47:17; 53:2; 71:2,
21; 72:9, 12
participants 40:6
participate 35:8; 38:5;
71:15
participated 21:7, 23
participation 36:2; 38:15
particular 34:24; 35:18;
36:17; 46:17, 17; 51:24;
60:21
particularly 40:23; 43:3
particulars 23:4
parties 37:8; 50:25; 51:3
partner 6:24
parts 56:24; 71:7
Party 10:22; 11:13;
16:16; 34:1, 2, 4; 51:6
pass 31:9
past 70:18
pattern 36:10, 23
Paul 10:9, 10
pay 22:14, 24; 44:10, 14;
54:18; 55:2; 63:22; 69:1
paying 68:25
payment 25:12; 56:8, 10,
11, 14, 15; 63:6
pending 19:20; 26:9;
42:3
Pennsylvania 46:7
people 15:3; 27:12, 13;
28:16, 17, 19; 31:7, 23;
32:8, 14; 36:16; 37:3; 39:9;
41:6, 6, 9, 24; 42:4; 43:7;
44:17; 45:15, 17; 46:8, 22,
25; 47:4, 5, 11, 19; 49:6,
18, 19, 21, 25; 50:3; 51:23;
52:2; 53:5; 54:14, 20, 21,
24; 57:13, 14, 19, 24; 59:2,
10, 15, 16, 17, 17, 23;
60:1; 61:21; 62:13, 23, 23;
71:20; 72:5; 73:7, 12, 17,
21; 75:3
people's 26:6
per 11:17; 49:19; 50:3
percent 67:21; 69:1
percentage 61:2, 6
perhaps 28:15; 64:4, 11;
71:12
period 7:14; 14:5, 19;
27:18; 28:11; 39:2; 56:5
permits 41:25
Perry 4:15; 5:1, 6, 10; 8:1;
10:12; 13:18; 19:2, 5, 14;
25:14, 20, 24; 26:6; 32:20;
34:24; 53:7; 75:4

person 15:25; 23:14;
26:13; 35:11; 38:22;
48:10; 60:21; 66:13;
67:21; 68:23
personal 22:4; 25:16, 20;
26:7; 38:24; 39:2, 4, 7;
71:9
personally 35:24; 38:11,
13; 39:25; 40:4; 46:12;
59:10; 62:14
personnel 32:6
persons 41:17
perspective 41:1
perspectives 41:10
persuade 38:23
pertinence 26:4
pertinent 35:18
phase 29:3
Phil 4:15; 25:22; 26:1
phone 14:20, 21; 16:5, 9,
10, 25; 24:11, 12, 24;
26:18, 21; 60:13; 62:13, 16
physically 46:1
pick 54:6
piece 38:15
pieces 53:24
piles 65:13, 13
place 27:17; 45:23; 46:3,
4, 5, 6; 52:9; 74:17
plan 70:20, 25
planning 57:7
Platform 7:1; 9:22; 10:3,
5, 15, 18, 18, 20, 21
Please 5:10; 6:13
pleased 36:11
pleasure 64:3
point 10:22; 11:14; 18:6,
7; 20:7; 22:24; 27:14; 28:2,
18; 47:24; 60:23
points 34:19
policies 16:13
policy 6:22; 7:12; 9:19;
11:9, 12, 14, 17, 20, 22,
25; 12:1, 6, 15, 16, 17, 18,
22; 13:2, 4, 5, 7, 15, 17;
14:10, 13, 21, 24; 15:1, 7,
8; 18:14; 21:12; 27:3; 28:8;
29:10, 11, 14; 30:5; 33:18,
18, 20; 34:6, 7, 12; 36:14;
37:1, 4, 7; 40:24; 41:3;
45:3; 49:17; 50:10, 11;
51:6; 52:2; 57:4, 6, 13, 25;
58:6, 8; 59:15, 17; 65:15,
17; 72:3, 5; 73:23; 74:19
political 33:21, 22, 23;
50:25; 51:2; 66:23
portion 19:3
position 6:21; 9:18, 24;
24:22; 28:4, 6, 7; 59:5
positions 34:11, 12
positive 34:20
possible 20:17; 54:23
potential 17:7; 18:16;
49:25; 59:1, 24; 60:24;
64:22; 70:24

power 43:1
practice 8:4; 9:1; 24:16;
25:6, 8; 53:12; 71:9; 73:12;
75:21
practiced 7:11
practicing 7:14, 18; 25:1
PRC 74:16; 75:2
precisely 19:3, 12
preferred 20:16
preparation 15:4; 48:25
prepare 21:21
prepared 18:16
preparing 10:18; 21:7
prerequisite 24:22
present 43:10
president 6:1; 7:12, 15;
9:16; 13:4; 14:9; 15:14, 16,
22; 16:5, 11; 17:4, 7, 20;
18:19; 20:22; 22:10; 28:8,
8; 30:4; 36:8; 39:22; 71:4,
6; 73:17; 75:16
President's 6:18
presidential 45:7
press 37:9; 49:20
Pressler 37:13; 39:9
pretty 17:22; 43:24; 44:5
previously 40:2; 60:3
prime 74:21
principal 23:18; 66:9
Principally 8:6; 72:18
prior 11:17, 18; 13:4;
14:24; 29:14; 74:3
priorities 48:22; 49:9
priority 24:18
private 75:13
Probably 11:1, 1; 31:23;
38:13; 59:25; 70:9; 75:11
probe 5:7; 26:6
procedures 42:2
proceed 5:10; 64:7
PROCEEDINGS 4:1
process 45:5; 55:20;
60:5
produce 32:6
produced 38:7
producer 55:2
producers 54:23
producing 48:17; 54:22;
56:17
production 48:15
professional 38:24;
39:2, 3, 4, 8; 45:17
professionally 14:8;
39:25; 40:5
professors 13:25
profit-making 50:16
program 6:22; 30:18;
32:3, 12; 53:2; 63:2
propose 36:16
prospective 60:6, 12
provide 41:10
provided 21:16, 17; 44:1
provision 43:1

provoke 37:10
public 4:6; 27:24; 36:25;
42:22, 24; 43:2; 53:1
publication 21:17; 51:8,
10, 14
publications 48:16;
49:3, 15; 51:15, 18
publicly 42:1
publish 27:6
published 12:12; 13:10;
51:11
purchased 54:13
purpose 20:9; 52:24
purposes 53:19
pursuant 4:18; 5:15
pursue 46:10
put 42:18; 48:16; 61:2;
62:15; 64:8
putting 21:24; 22:6; 35:6;
36:3; 38:15; 49:1

Q

quality 55:6, 9
quarterly 21:16; 50:3
questioned 70:8
quick 5:1
quickly 36:2
quite 25:17; 50:21

R

R 6:1
R-Nev 10:13
rack-up 62:25
radar 43:2
raise 67:10; 70:15, 20;
71:1
raised 67:9, 21
raising 61:1, 20; 68:25;
75:23
Ralph 13:25
ran 31:23
range 21:12, 14
rarely 61:18
rate 32:5; 50:16
reach 31:2, 4
reaching 35:15
read 38:6; 48:21; 65:6;
70:17
reader 59:21
reading 48:3
Reagan 6:16; 39:22
Reagan's 36:8
really 14:15; 25:3, 14;
33:24; 36:22; 43:1; 57:20;
59:4; 75:15
reasonable 72:11
reasons 19:10; 50:20
recall 11:3, 4; 14:15;
16:10; 17:12; 22:16, 17,
19, 22; 24:12; 35:1; 36:5,

7; 37:23; 40:10; 44:7;
45:23, 25; 47:1, 16, 23;
48:13; 56:20, 22; 57:5;
59:4; 62:5; 65:3, 4; 68:5, 7,
22; 69:16, 17; 70:21; 72:13
receipt 63:7
receipts 54:16; 63:2;
66:9
receive 10:3; 49:15;
50:25; 56:18
received 9:25; 10:2;
12:20, 23; 42:4; 50:23;
51:5; 69:16
Recent 39:4
recently 68:15
reception 46:18
receptions 45:14, 23;
46:3, 8, 16; 47:2, 15, 18;
48:12
Recess 40:14; 42:12
recollection 38:9
recommend 33:5
recommendation 33:7
recommendations 59:6
recommended 58:25;
59:2, 3, 10
record 4:17; 5:14, 25;
48:6; 75:17
records 61:12
recreate 16:18
recreation 34:22
recruit 51:21
reduced 67:20
Reed 7:11, 19, 23; 8:5, 9,
16
referring 47:25
reflection 34:2
reform 34:10; 36:18; 43:9
refuse 64:22
refused 64:25
refusing 25:19
regarding 5:2, 5, 7, 19;
48:15; 65:15
regular 30:15, 18; 31:17,
19
regularly 62:14
regulation 34:15, 16;
35:13
regulatory 41:15, 21, 25;
42:5
reimbursed 52:6, 12
related 57:10; 72:10
relating 19:25
Relations 39:10; 73:20,
21
relationship 32:7
relatively 50:17; 65:14
reluctant 61:13
remain 14:6
remained 23:2
remember 16:7; 26:22;
36:12; 39:22; 51:9; 68:23
remote 57:14, 18

removed 30:3
Renaissance 43:23;
52:9
rent 43:22
replace 74:18
replaced 22:4; 27:23, 25;
28:5
reporting 62:10; 63:8
representation 75:1
representative-type
46:25
representatives 41:16;
45:16; 46:17, 19; 73:14
represented 4:21, 23
representing 25:23, 24
Republic 73:14
Republican 6:25; 9:22;
10:22; 11:12; 16:13; 34:3,
17, 23; 50:5, 5; 52:18;
55:11; 57:12
Republicans 34:6
request 5:16; 12:25;
19:22; 21:4; 22:7
requesting 21:8
research 13:24; 47:9
reserve 42:16
RESN 55:24; 56:11, 14
respective 38:16; 41:1
response 12:19; 21:7;
22:6; 31:11; 67:25
responses 62:22
responsibilities 9:17;
10:16; 17:20; 18:9, 17;
23:12; 25:4
responsibility 18:11;
48:19; 52:3
responsible 18:18;
21:24; 22:5; 30:6, 13;
48:25; 58:18; 61:19
Rest 13:9; 15:1; 28:3
restaurant 46:6
result 37:4
resume 6:13
retail 42:25
retaliation 41:15, 21
returned 12:20; 65:4
revenues 18:9; 63:9
review 59:19; 73:8
reviewed 20:1, 7; 38:4
Right 4:20; 5:13; 11:10;
39:18; 50:21; 56:10, 11
ripe 42:22
risk 42:2
RNC 16:15; 18:22, 25;
22:13, 18, 23; 23:2; 31:2,
15, 17, 20; 32:1, 4, 13, 19;
54:11, 16, 19, 24; 55:4;
63:4, 7, 19, 22
RNC's 54:13
road 31:3, 8
ROC 73:18; 75:1
Rock 57:17
role 12:6; 33:17; 35:4;

48:14, 15; 49:2, 5, 14
Rome 22:3
ROSENBERG 4:9, 13;
5:4, 9, 13, 23; 8:3; 10:14;
13:21; 19:17; 25:18, 22;
26:1, 8; 32:23; 35:3; 40:12,
15; 53:10; 75:7, 17, 19
rough 37:18
roughly 14:18; 49:18;
55:2; 63:3
routinely 53:4
run 36:15
running 15:7

S

salary 17:24; 25:7, 9, 12
Salatch 31:13
same 6:25; 33:4; 38:21;
42:4; 48:10; 50:8; 69:11
Sanders 7:11, 19
Sanford 31:8, 14
Satellite 55:11, 25; 56:9,
12, 15
satellites 56:3
satisfy 20:8
saw 14:22; 56:19, 21;
68:19, 20
saying 56:2
schedule 42:12, 12;
73:10
schedules 42:10
scheduling 42:10
scholars 14:1
school 6:5, 7, 9, 14
science 33:21; 36:8;
39:21
scope 5:19; 25:15, 21
screen 43:2
se 11:17
second 21:4; 22:6; 65:22
secretary 7:8; 9:9; 31:7;
74:12
security 73:16
seeing 56:21
seeking 16:14; 41:25;
42:9
seem 46:11; 69:3
seemed 20:10
selling 44:25; 45:12, 13
Senate 4:15; 36:19;
39:10; 41:3
Senator 5:19; 12:8, 9;
14:4; 36:11, 15; 37:12, 13;
39:9, 12, 19
send 62:12
senior 6:1; 7:15; 14:3;
27:16, 17; 28:19; 38:1
sense 8:10, 11; 13:11;
21:16; 27:2, 2, 7; 28:2;
29:5; 38:13; 44:25; 45:4;
48:18; 49:4, 16; 50:2, 10,
14, 15, 23; 51:1, 17; 53:23;

60:8; 69:3
sent 38:13; 49:24; 51:2, 3,
3; 64:9; 68:23
separate 18:25; 58:7;
64:18; 75:2
separately 18:22
September 10:1
series 50:2
served 6:17, 20; 7:4, 13
services 44:2; 54:13
set 18:21; 49:23; 62:6;
73:7
setting 34:7; 43:25
seven 32:2
several 11:13; 13:9;
60:20; 72:6
Shanghai 72:19, 19, 25;
73:25; 74:14
shaped 35:12
shaping 35:4; 37:1
shared 16:19
Shaw 73:20
sheets 53:3
Shih-Ding 73:15
short 51:12
shortly 16:6; 17:12; 24:4;
27:22; 28:23; 39:15
shot 51:13
show 32:6; 45:4, 9; 53:23;
54:1, 2, 17, 17, 22; 55:13,
21, 22, 24; 56:4, 13, 21
showed 16:15; 55:18
shows 54:5; 56:12, 17;
57:1, 8, 11
side 38:2
Sieong 68:13
sightseeing 73:11
sign-up 53:3
Signal 22:21
signed 12:1, 3; 55:16, 17
Signet 22:12, 15; 23:1, 4;
63:6, 6, 19, 22
situation 18:5
six 32:2; 54:3, 3, 4; 56:5,
17
SKLAMBERG 19:15, 15
slow 20:18; 35:13
small 50:17; 53:24;
65:14; 71:7
smaller 23:1
solicitations 44:13;
63:25
solicited 44:21; 49:6;
66:14, 20; 67:5
somebody 60:16; 62:18;
64:2; 65:4; 69:1; 71:11
somehow 54:11
someone 38:12; 69:6, 10
something 34:20; 38:23;
43:3; 45:10; 48:19; 70:11,
13; 75:6
sometime 11:1; 12:5;
14:5; 15:17, 18; 17:12;

20:25; 23:24; 26:17;
58:16; 75:11
sometimes 20:13; 30:9;
31:6, 8; 41:5; 44:21;
9:6, 8; 51:23, 25;
52:2; 56:25
somewhere 17:13; 57:2;
72:14
soon 20:17
sorry 10:1, 10; 48:5
sort 8:14; 14:23; 18:12;
21:20; 34:20; 35:10;
38:20; 42:14, 17; 43:4, 11,
22; 46:12; 47:8, 20; 50:18;
51:5, 7; 52:10; 54:15;
57:21; 59:23; 61:4, 25;
75:9
sorts 8:7
sound 44:2
source 59:25; 66:9; 67:6
sources 70:15
South 38:1
Southern 37:25
space 28:25
speak 13:12; 14:18; 15:9,
11; 41:2, 3
speaker 36:7, 9, 10;
45:19; 66:24; 67:1, 2;
69:19
speakers 35:9; 37:18
sneaking 14:25
social 4:14
specific 11:4; 12:14;
18:4; 19:9; 59:18
specifically 12:23;
39:18; 45:15; 47:17, 23;
62:5
specifics 23:7
speech 75:13
speed 34:13
spend 25:2; 61:5
spending 24:25
spent 60:25; 71:24; 73:3
spoke 13:8, 9; 14:12;
15:2, 3; 20:12; 32:7, 13;
45:20, 20, 21; 60:1
spoken 14:17
spokespeople 41:1, 15,
20
sponsored 72:19
spot 23:24
spring 45:24; 58:17;
60:15
stabilized 28:15
staff 10:17; 17:22; 20:24;
27:10, 11, 16, 18; 28:10,
17, 20; 31:5, 15; 32:20;
35:22; 40:23; 41:4, 6; 51:4,
52:1; 75:18
staffs 51:4
stage 53:1
started 27:19; 28:11;
32:25; 39:5
starting 29:14; 33:17

state 5:24; 7:8; 9:10;
39:10, 14
stated 18:10
States 4:15; 36:13; 71:14;
72:21
status 18:23; 19:18, 19;
20:11, 22; 66:4
stay 58:15
stayed 6:23; 7:7, 9;
58:16; 71:18
steering 51:21
stepped 75:18
still 7:14, 21; 19:20; 21:2;
33:11; 64:16
stock 70:12
stops 73:1
stored 37:21; 64:20
storehouse 64:20
Street 6:2; 46:6; 55:5, 8;
59:22; 61:8; 73:8
stretches 61:11
strike 68:20
structure 17:22; 35:7, 9;
60:10
student 13:24
Studies 71:14; 72:20;
74:9
studio 32:5
stuff 25:20
style 46:13
subcommittee 37:15
subject 35:16; 44:17;
75:1, 3
subjects 42:13; 59:18
submission 21:24
submit 49:11
subpoena 4:18
subscribers 50:6, 17
subscription 50:16
subsequent 36:23; 40:7,
9
substantial 71:2
substantially 36:4
substantive 40:25; 41:2,
4
success 36:1
successful 62:21
sufficient 59:7
suggested 47:11
suggestions 32:18;
47:14, 18, 21
summer 11:2, 5, 6; 12:5,
12; 13:11, 20; 14:16;
28:13; 45:24
sun 33:25; 34:4; 43:5
supervisor 29:21
supplemental 19:22;
21:4; 22:7
support 44:21; 70:24
supporting 45:10
suppose 17:8
Sure 6:6, 14; 10:2; 15:3;
21:14; 24:21; 25:14;

30:24; 31:22, 22; 36:1;
47:16; 48:9; 52:10; 60:6;
69:4
surprise 12:24; 20:19
surprised 17:3; 19:18;
20:10
sworn 4:5
system 9:20; 33:22, 23,
24, 25; 44:2; 64:8
systems 38:17

T

table 45:1
Taipei 73:1, 4, 13, 21, 25;
74:24
Taiwanese 66:15
talk 30:19; 31:5; 41:5, 7;
48:24; 52:25; 60:6; 62:13;
72:4
talked 11:13; 13:16; 16:5;
26:14; 31:6, 17, 20; 32:1,
16; 44:19, 19; 45:3, 4, 4, 6;
46:21; 54:20; 58:20; 59:8,
23; 60:12; 62:23
talking 40:16; 48:9;
51:20; 57:24; 60:23; 64:14
tapes 57:2
tasks 26:25
tax 20:13
team 27:15
technical 54:14
technically 56:1
Ted 68:12
telecommunications
21:13; 34:10, 14; 35:4, 23;
36:6, 14, 18; 37:2, 12, 14;
38:25; 43:7, 9
teleconference 38:10
telephone 15:25; 16:1, 2,
21
television 32:3, 12; 45:4;
58:3, 4
tends 34:2
Teng-Hui 73:17
tenure 24:16; 70:4; 74:11
term 52:22
terms 18:3, 15; 25:3;
36:22; 42:9; 60:8
test 20:9
testified 4:6; 23:10;
26:20; 39:23; 40:2, 18;
53:21; 58:10; 60:2; 74:25
testify 39:18, 24
testimony 54:10
tests 20:3
Thanks 48:10
Thanksgiving 15:18;
17:13
themes 56:25
themselves 44:23
thereafter 16:7; 17:12;
28:23

They're 64:17
They've 9:6
think-tank 41:7, 17; 66:5
think-tanks 23:16; 27:8;
37:8; 71:21, 23
thinking 45:15, 19; 71:12
Thompson 5:19
Thompson's 65:6
thought 16:19; 17:6;
29:19; 34:19; 35:18;
36:19; 37:5, 9; 42:8; 43:4;
44:17; 46:22; 47:7; 48:3,
22; 49:7; 59:18; 62:13;
71:22; 72:4; 74:21
three 14:19; 45:13; 61:10;
67:12; 68:15; 69:11
throughout 28:24
ticket 72:24
tickets 45:1, 12, 13
Tim 22:4
Time-Warner 37:24
timely 42:13, 19, 20
times 14:19; 31:24;
41:14; 53:18; 54:3; 60:20;
61:10
timing 43:13
title 48:18
today 4:12; 7:21; 60:20
together 21:25; 22:6;
30:8, 10; 35:6; 36:3; 42:18;
49:1; 62:15; 67:12
told 18:11; 23:20; 54:24;
67:19
took 19:4, 5; 27:2; 40:16;
45:23; 46:5, 5; 52:9; 71:9,
13; 74:17; 75:21
top 37:17
topic 51:24
topical 29:11
topics 17:23; 56:25; 57:5,
10
total 61:3; 63:1, 2
touch 30:18
town 8:1; 37:9
trade 21:13; 41:16; 45:17;
60:17, 22; 64:6; 65:11
transcription 44:1
transfer 56:13
transferred 55:13
transition 45:7
transitioning 28:23; 29:2
transmit 56:4
travel 71:3; 72:12
travels 62:16
treasury 44:11, 12; 54:9
Trent 10:19
tried 35:17; 41:8; 57:22,
25; 60:9
trip 71:13; 72:6, 13, 20;
74:9, 14; 75:9, 10, 15, 15
trips 71:5, 7, 9; 72:9, 16;
74:3, 6; 75:8, 20, 21, 22,
25

true 32:20
try 33:19; 38:20, 21
trying 34:5; 74:18
turn 63:12
turned 37:11; 43:9; 65:5
TV 32:5; 53:18, 22, 23;
54:1; 55:13
Twenty 46:9
twice 13:8
two 13:24; 14:19; 20:23;
23:1, 24:11; 28:16; 30:10;
31:22; 45:15, 19; 46:1, 1;
49:19; 51:12, 17; 53:5;
55:5, 8; 57:4; 61:10; 69:23;
71:17
two-party 33:24
type 21:8
typical 27:7; 43:11; 57:6
Typically 62:8

U

U.N 9:19; 72:21; 73:2
U.S 6:19; 9:6, 7, 19; 66:7,
8; 67:15; 74:8
UK 74:16
UKFCO 73:7
ultimately 30:6, 12
unaware 70:19
under 67:11; 68:10
understood 18:13; 24:21
undertake 55:15
undertook 23:22
unhappy 46:13
United 4:14; 13:11;
36:13; 71:14, 16; 72:21;
75:2
university 50:6, 18;
71:14
unsure 56:1
up 11:15; 12:1, 3; 15:7;
16:24; 18:21; 20:14;
24:19; 42:10; 43:2, 25;
47:19; 54:6; 55:18; 57:9;
61:22; 62:6, 14; 64:2, 15,
21; 73:7
updated 21:18
use 32:5; 52:22; 56:12
used 32:4; 41:16; 44:14;
52:17; 53:11; 63:22
useful 45:2
usually 31:4; 44:1
utility 42:24

V

vacant 28:3
van 13:9; 14:25; 28:3;
52:7
variation 44:6
varied 38:19
variety 8:6; 34:6; 39:13;
46:23; 49:9; 50:20; 57:22;

59:14
various 9:20; 34:19;
37:8; 41:1; 44:3; 48:14;
49:15; 72:5, 9
vary 44:4
vehicle 16:13; 52:17
vendor 32:4; 54:13
version 51:12, 12
versions 51:12
versus 25:1; 34:15; 35:13
vice 6:1; 7:15; 28:7, 8;
30:3
view 33:20; 34:3, 20;
44:23; 57:20
Virginia 57:18
virtually 64:1
visible 42:1
visit 60:16
voluntarily 4:18; 5:18
voluntary 4:13
votes 52:10

W

W-i-e-g-e-r-s 48:7
wait 61:9
walked 53:1
Wall 59:22; 73:8
wants 26:2
Washington 6:3, 15;
14:22; 21:12; 27:8; 29:10,
14; 41:7; 45:16, 18; 46:24;
60:17; 66:23; 72:25; 73:6,
16
way 11:19; 16:20; 20:18;
30:11; 35:17; 38:21;
46:11; 56:1, 8; 63:24; 64:6;
72:23
ways 13:13; 40:20
Week 59:22
weekend 73:11
weekly 61:4
weeks 61:7; 68:15, 19;
70:19
Welgers 48:4, 5; 58:11,
14, 19; 62:2; 70:22
Weil 28:4; 48:17
weren't 20:15; 55:19;
65:2
West 69:14, 20
Westner 28:1; 32:6;
48:24; 54:20
what-not 71:21
wheeling 42:25
whenever 30:22; 64:13
whereby 56:3
Whereupon 4:2
wherever 31:3
Who's 66:22
whole 11:13
whomever 60:21
whose 65:10; 67:16

wide 46:23
wife 39:20
Wiggins 27:23; 47:9;
48:1
willing 44:18
Winter 13:25
wish 35:14
within 25:14; 39:5; 44:6;
72:24
Without 59:12; 64:10;
73:1
WITNESS 5:11; 8:2;
10:13; 13:20; 19:4, 7;
25:16; 26:1, 3; 32:21;
34:25; 53:9; 75:5
Wolcott 28:9; 30:1
words 8:22; 18:6; 23:5;
34:14; 44:13; 45:8; 55:14
work 13:5; 17:13; 18:15;
25:13; 27:5; 30:18; 42:11;
44:19; 45:2, 6, 8, 21;
46:23; 47:8, 20; 48:23;
60:7, 13, 19; 66:24, 25
workaday 52:3
worked 10:19; 14:4;
32:10, 16; 39:20; 63:22,
24; 72:23
working 7:17; 21:3;
30:20; 39:5
worth 45:10
writing 13:24; 45:6; 48:25
written 74:25
wrong 28:22; 54:11

X

X 31:9; 47:13

Y

Y 47:13
Yale 6:6, 7
yeah 47:16
year 7:16; 24:5; 43:8;
58:16; 63:14, 15, 16, 23
years 31:22; 39:5, 19
Young 23:6, 8; 65:21;
70:1
Yu-Ming 73:20